DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 685 FL 013 989

AUTHOR Gandara, Patricia
TITLE Evaluation of Second Language Institutes for California State Department of Education.
INSTITUTION California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Div. of Special Education.
PUB DATE May 83
GRANT 34-03651-Y749-00-82
NOTE 158p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Awareness; Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Language Tests; *Limited English Speaking; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; *Student Evaluation; Summer Programs; Testing

ABSTRACT

The effectiveness of the Second Language Institutes, summer programs designed to instruct educators of limited English proficient children in languages, cultural awareness, and assessment methods, was evaluated. Data were collected through site observation and interviews, and questionnaires completed by institute participants and their supervisors. Overall, 75 percent of the respondents stated that the curriculum was adequate to their needs. Several instructional practices were identified as particularly successful, including language immersion settings and the opportunity to practice the assessment techniques with actual students. The participants' information needs were influenced by their background characteristics. Recommendations were made regarding assessment instruments and institute curriculum design. (Author/RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235685

EVALUATION OF SECOND LANGUAGE INSTITUTES[1]

for

California State Department of Education

Office of Special Education

Grant # 34-03651-Y749-00-82

By

Patricia Gándara, Ph.D.

May 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Calif. State Dept. of Educ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL013989

[1] The findings and conclusions of this study are the sole responsibility of the principal investigator and do not imply the official position or endorsement of the California State Department of Education.

SUMMARY

Evaluation of Second Language Institutes

May 1983

The evaluation of the Second Language Institutes was designed to include all nine institute sites, all participants at the sites, and at least one supervisor for each participant. The basic questions to be answered by the evaluation were the following:

1. What is the overall perception of the effectiveness of the institutes by both participants and supervisors?
2. Which instructional practices are most successful in achieving competency in the three instructional component areas?
3. What are the information needs of the participants with respect to the three instructional components?
4. How should/do instructional practices and informational needs differ for participants depending on particular background characteristics?
5. Which key program features should be included in all institutes?

The study method selected to answer these questions included three levels of data collection: site observation and interviews; participant questionnaires; and participants' supervisors questionnaires. Data collected were both formative and summetive in nature and the emphasis of the study was on effective program features.

Participant response rate was 80% and supervisor response rate was 72% of those individuals mailed a questionnaire.

General results were the following:

Overall, the institutes could be considered moderately successful in achieving their objectives of increasing participants' skills in language, cultural awareness, and assessment of LEP children. An average of 25% of respondents stated the programs did not meet their needs; the remaining 75% felt the curriculum was at least adequate for their needs.

Among supervisors who responded to the survey, there was an

overwhelming endorsement of the institutes with 84% stating it was helpful to them to have an institute-trained person on their staff and 93% desiring that the program be continued.

A number of instructional practices were identified as being particularly successful for each of the three instructional components - among these were language immersion settings with integrated curricula and frequent opportunities to use the second language, cultural programs that focused on historical and social-psychological antecedents to present-day educational issues, and assessment instruction that provided participants ample time to become familiar with instruments and techniques and opportunities for practice with real students.

Highlights of the information needs of the participants included learning special education terminology in the second language, learning to convey assessment information to parents and others in the second language, learning the second language as it is spoken in California and the Southwest. Additionally, participants wanted a cultural curriculum that was not condescending and acknowledged their familiarity with the target group. Assessment information needs included curricula that were more geared to their occupational specialty and less singularly focused on psychological assessment.

Background characteristics of participants were found to have an effect on the participants' evaluation of programs and their stated needs. Overall, multiple-time attendees tended to be more satisfied with the way programs were organized but felt they wanted more language instruction than was being offered. There was some tendency for Hispanics to want less language instruction and, along with Asians, a greater focus on culture. Psychologists much more frequently requested that increased time be devoted to language instruction, while speech and language specialists wanted a greater focus on assessment.

Finally, the evaluation report makes 16 recommendations of key features that should be considered for implementation at all sites to strengthen the Second Language Institute program.

Some major recommendations included:

1. A better method for assessing students' language skill before the start of the program should be investigated. A more standardized and reliable approach would facilitate future evaluation as well as minimize time lost in placing students in appropriate groups.
2. The assessment curriculum overall should be more equalized to focus on speech and language issues, instruments, and techniques as well as psychological assessment. Also, the particular needs of bilingual teachers, resource specialists, nurses, and others should be examined to see if it is reasonable for them to participate in the same courses with psychologists and speech/language specialists.
3. Consideration should be made of the possibility of standardizing the assessment curriculum so that all students could receive greater breadth and take advantage of the range of accumulated knowledge and experience offered by instructors at various sites. This might be accomplished by separating the assessment and language components, offering assessment at a few local sites utilizing the same personnel and a "packaged" curriculum. Language instruction could then take place in Mexico or U.S. sites.
4. The assessment component should include more "hands-on" experience with students who are comparable to the ones that institute participants will actually be working with.
5. Assessment and language components should attempt to provide more opportunities for participants to communicate test findings and observations to parents or parent-like subjects.
6. Programs should strive to utilize the knowledge of "target group participants" (Hispanics and Asians) in the culture component. Interesting and informative discussions can take place utilizing these resources.
7. To the extent possible all programs should attempt an immersion-type curriculum which allows the maximum possible use of the second language throughout the day. Students who cannot profit from this should probably be segregated

into different groupings.

8. All institutes should consider including a year-round follow-up component to the regular curriculum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction

A. Purpose of the Study 1

B. Background to the Study and Previous Research 2

II. Study Design

A. Overview 5

B. Methods 6

C. Analyses 9

III. Results

A. Participant Response Rate 11

B. Across-site Findings 13

C. Analyses by Participant Background Characteristics . 19

D. Analyses of Individual Sites 26

E. Supervisor Response Rates 52

F. Analyses of Supervisor Questionnaires 54

IV. Discussion 61

V. Summary and Recommendations

A. Summary 77

B. Recommendations 81

VI. References 85

VII. Appendix A. Instruments 86

Appendix B. Frequency Profiles 97

Appendix C. Task Outline 126

Appendix D. Program Feature Profiles 131

I INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Study

The present evaluation of the Second Language Institutes was commissioned by the State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, during the summer of 1982. The primary objectives of the evaluation were to (1) determine if the Institutes are effective in achieving their stated objectives, and (2) provide information about which features of the programs appear to be most effective, helpful and informative for the participants. Hence, the study method was to include the collection and analysis of both formative and summative data.

The basic questions to be answered by the evaluation are the following:

1. What is the overall perception of effectiveness of the institutes by both participants and participants' supervisors?
2. Which instructional practices are most successful in achieving competency in:
   (a) second language facility
   (b) cultural awareness
   (c) assessment methods and techniques
3. What are the information needs of the participants with respect to:
   (a) second language facility
   (b) cultural awareness

(c) assessment methods and techniques

4. How should/do instructional practices and informational needs differ for participants depending on their:

(a) professional specialty

(b) years in the Second Language Institute Program

(c) ethnic background

5. Which key program features should be included in all second language institutes?

B. Background to the Study and Previous Research

The Second Language Institutes program was initially funded in the summer of 1980 by the Office of Special Education. Its objectives were threefold: (1) to help assessment personnel who had already developed some second language proficiency to further develop their second language skills; (2) to provide participants with information about cultural background and its importance in the assessment and planning process for LEP students; and (3) to provide an assessment practicum for the participants which would include instruction and experience in procedures relevant to the evaluation, diagnosis, and educational planning for the LEP child. The training was to take place during six week summer sessions. Since that time some attempts have been made to evaluate the effectiveness of the institutes, however, each of these efforts has been limited in scope and hampered by methodological difficulties. Internal evaluations such as those conducted by BABEL (1981)

and Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools (1981) suffer from the obvious limitation of potential bias or lack of objectivity. In addition, these evaluations have focused on participants' attainment of program-specific objectives, but have not attempted to measure the usefulness of these skills in an on-the-job situation.

The 1981 evaluation by Scriven, Glass and Davis focused exclusively on second language acquisition and was hindered by non-comparability of samples. Covarying techniques were utilized to minimize the problem of large pre-test score differences, but between site comparisons were virtually invalidated due to differences in pre-test data. Despite these problems, Scriven, et al. were able to conclude that an overall gain of .7 of a standard deviation was achieved by most of the institute participants, demonstrating a "significant" improvement in general language skills. However, since this finding was not anchored to any on-the-job performance measure, it is not clear what such a gain means in terms of job effectiveness. Further, this evaluation did not assess the effectiveness of either of the other two program components: cultural awareness or assessment methodology.

Finally, an attempt was made by Foley (1981) to collect data on the degree to which participants felt the programs had achieved their goals. A survey was mailed to the participants after they returned to their jobs. As a first cut this provided some inter-

esting information, our difficulties in quantifying responses as well as a 35 percent non-response rate limited the generalizability of the survey results.

In sum, while some earnest attempts have been made to evaluate the perceived effectiveness of the Second Language Institutes, no comprehensive objective evaluation has yet been conducted. The fact that all previous evaluation efforts have concluded that the institutes are indeed successful in accelerating second language acquisition lends credibility to this finding. However, past evaluations have failed to ask many other important questions, such as:

- What are the effects of enhanced second language ability for on-the-job performance?
- How do schools benefit from the participants' improved skills?
- Which features of culture and assessment training are most useful to program participants?
- Which features of program organization appear most conducive to transmitting the institutes' curricula?

Each of these questions is also addressed in the process of answering the five global questions listed in section I.A.

II STUDY DESIGN

A. Overview

The present evaluation included all nine of the institute sites and was designed to consist of three phases of data collection: (1) on-site observation and interview; (2) collection of mail survey data from all participants; and (3) collection of mail survey data from participants' supervisors. All three sets of data were to be analyzed and then combined to provide a comprehensive picture of the features of each of the institutes, perceptions of staff, participants and participants' supervisors of the effectiveness of these features, and perceptions of the effectiveness of the institutes as a whole. Since the data is necessarily subjective, we deemed it most informative to collect data from as many sources as possible.

It is also worth noting that not only the variety of data sources, but the quality of those sources, lend a unique credability to the findings. The fact that the "subjects" (study respondents) are themselves experts in instructional methodology and many have expertise in related content areas, makes their appraisal of the effectiveness of program features especially valuable. This aspect of the evaluation strengthened both its reliability and validity while providing insights into the probable needs of future participants which would not have been possible with less sophisticated respondents. We believe this is an important factor for the reader to keep in mind as she/he

reviews the results of the study.

B. Methods

The evaluation began during the summer of 1982 with onsite observations of each of the institutes in operation.[1] One member of the study team (P. Gándara or M. Samulon) visited each site, interviewed directors, staff, and participants, and observed all instructional components. It was generally possible to do this in one full day. Both observation and interview data were recorded on predesigned protocols developed for this purpose.[2] Data collected at the sites was then used to develop a separate Program Feature Profile for each of the institute sites (see Appendix B for copies). The profile was then sent to each of the institute directors to review for accuracy. Once agreement was reached as to the accuracy of the profiles they were used as the basis for interpreting the overall organization of the program as well as the instructional methods, curriculum, and teaching staff employed.

In the fall of 1982, after participants had completed the program and returned to their work assignments, they were mailed a survey questionnaire to fill out and mail back. Attached to this questionnaire was a request for the name and address of a

---

1. This is with the exception of the National Hispanic University site which was not included in the observation due to a change in scheduling. Information for the Profile was gathered from interview of the director and others who had observed the program.
2. Reliabilities between data collectors were established through extensive discussion before and after site visits, comparison with written program descriptions and review of observation notes by institute directors.

work supervisor who could also comment on the usefulness/effectiveness of the Second Language Institute program as it had affected his/her staff members.

Finally, in early 1983 the supervisors' questionnaire was mailed to all persons nominated by the participants. A more detailed description of the content of the two questionnaires follows in the section below titled Instruments, and copies of the instruments can be found in Appendix A.

Also, a detailed task-by-task outline of evaluation procedures is included in Appendix C for those who are interested in greater specificity of methods.

1. Sample

All participants of all institutes were included in the study. Although there were some discrepencies in the participant lists of a couple of the institutes, we believe there were 183 participants in all of the summer institutes. All of these individuals were mailed questionnaires and followup reminders to return their questionnaires. Eighty percent of the participants responded. (A more detailed discussion of response rates follows in the Results chapter since great variation in response rates for the different institutes complicates our interpretation of the results.)

The sample size for the Supervisor Survey was necessarily smaller, since not all respondents nominated a supervisor. One hundred and twelve Supervisor Surveys were mailed out (and fol-

lowed by reminders) and 72 percent of these were returned.

2. Instruments

Three instruments were developed by the principal investigator for the purpose of collecting data. Since it was impossible to "pilot" the instruments in the traditional sense (it would have required "contaminating" subjects to do so), all instruments were reviewed by Department of Education - Office of Special Education staff members familiar with the institutes before they were used with subjects. In all cases some minor changes were made in the instruments as a result of the review. Additionally, the first instrument -- the Observation and Interview Protocol -- was shortened and streamlined somewhat as a result of its first site application.

The three instruments developed for this study included: (1) the Observation and Interview Protocol which was a five page instrument covering virtually all aspects of program organization, staffing, physical environment, participants, language, culture, and assessment training, and staff perceptions of both problems and strengths associated with the program (see Appendix A); (2) the Participants' Survey which included 31 mostly multiple choice questions about the general operation of the program, instructional content of each component (langauge, culture and assessment), and background information about the participants (see Appendix A); (3) the Supervisors' Survey which included nine questions about participants' benefits and general usefulness of the program (see Appendix A).

C. Analyses

Each of the three sets of data collected was analyzed separately. On-site observation and interview data were analyzed individually for each site to prepare the Program Feature Profiles. Analysis of the participant data included frequency tabulations for all sites combined and for each individual site to derive relative effectiveness ratings, and sites were ranked along four dimensions -- program length, language, culture and assessment components -- for overall highest and lowest ratings. Cross tabulations between site characteristics and participant background characteristics (i.e., sex, ethnicity, professional capacity, and number of years attending an institute) to determine patterns of needs and effectiveness according to participant characteristics, were also performed as well as analyses of comments by staff and participants to enrich our understanding of the quantitative data. After the first two sets of data had been analyzed individually, these results were combined to pair high effectiveness ratings with particular curricular and methodological features of the institutes. In this way it was possible to draw some conclusions about especially effective program characteristics and to make recommendations for improving future institutes.

Finally, the third set of data, the supervisor survey, was analyzed by performing frequency tabulations of each of the nine items included in the questionnaire and utilizing cross-tabulations

to separate responses by institute. However, the individual site analyses proved to be of little value since there was great variation in the number of responses by site.

III RESULTS

A. Participant Response Rates

Of the 183 participants in all institutes for the summer of 1982, 146 returned questionnaires. This resulted in an 80% response rate for all participants. However, there was great variability in response rates by site, as well as wide variation in the number of attendees - ranging from nine to 50. This variation is shown in the table below. Numbers in the first column represent the number of attendees at the institute; percentages represent the rate of return.

Table 1

Participant Return Rates

Site	Attendees	Percent Returns
Cal State-L.A./L.A. County	35	86%
National Hispanic University-Guadalajara	50	96%
La Verne-Cuernavaca	19	63%
Cal State-Fullerton	9	89%
University of Pacific - Stockton	14	79%
San Diego	14*	57%
Tulare	13	92%
Stanislaus	13	79%
Fresno	16	50%

* There was some discrepancy in this figure on different participant lists. It is our belief that 14 people completed the program.

Generally, the better established institutes had higher rates of response; institutes that were reported to have experienced more problems also had lower response rates. We speculate from this that participants who felt the institute experience had been worthwhile were more likely to return the questionnaire. Although a few questionnaires were returned from participants who clearly relished the opportunity to air their grievances. Since it is impossible to know, with certainty, why participants at some institutes were so reluctant to return surveys, despite follow-up reminders, findings for those sites with especially low return rates should be interpreted with caution.

B. Across-site Findings

The first analysis of the participant data was across-site frequencies to determine participant evaluations of the Second Language Institute program as a whole. This yields a perspective on the general effectiveness of the program as well as providing a comparison reference when analyzing data by individual sites.

Participant Characteristics. Table 2 displays major background characteristics of the responding participants.

Table 2

Respondent Characteristics - All Sites

Sex		Times Attended	
male	23%	once	68%
female	77%	twice	25%
		three	7%
Ethnicity		**Professional Role**	
Anglo	75%	School Psych.	30%
Hispanic	16%	Nurse	2%
Black	2%	Speech/Lang.	29%
Asian	5%	Resource Spec.	15%
Other	.7%	Bilingual Tch.	11%
		Other*	11%

* This category included some individuals who identified themselves as having more than one title, administrators, and currently unemployed/return students.

The reader will note that the "typical" responding participant was female, white/Anglo, was attending a summer institute for

the first time and was working either as a school psychologist or speech and language specialist. Analyses of how respondents evaluated the Second Language Institutes according to sex, ethnicity, times attended, and professional role will be presented in Section C of this chapter.

Program Organization. Overall, respondents appear to have been quite satisfied with the general manner in which the institutes were organized. Most respondents (approximately three-quarters) felt that both the total length and the daily length of the programs was "about right". (We will see in the individual site analyses that there are differences in satisfaction depending on whether the program was of six or four weeks duration.) Eighty-six percent of respondents stated that location of the program was very important in their decision to attend. For those who attended local programs "convenience" was the overwhelming factor in their choice. For those who attended programs in Mexico a desire for cultural and linguistic immersion was critical; for this group, convenience was not a primary concern. Most respondents (87%) also felt that the number of participants in their program was "about right" which was interesting, given the wide range in number of attendees at the different institutes. Most (82%) were also happy with the professional composition of their fellow participants. However, there was greater dissatisfaction with the level of linguistic ability of their fellow participants. One quarter felt there was too much variability in ability, and another 15% felt others were either too highly or too lowly skilled. Three

quarters of the respondents reported they felt there had been adequate staffing to meet the instructional needs of the program.

Language Instruction. Table 3 displays the percentage breakdowns for participant responses to the questions about the language instruction they received.

Table 3

Language Instruction - All Sites (N=146)

Time Devoted to Instruction		Instructional Methods	
Too little	33%	Boring	16%
About right	62%	Standard	49%
Too much	6%	Creative	36%
Instructional Content		Instructors	
Did not focus on needs	23%	Not good	10%
Adequate	42%	Adequate	28%
Focused exactly on needs	34%	Excellent	43%
		Varied/uneven	20%

The reader will note that fully one-third of the respondents felt that inadequate time had been spent on language instruction; very few respondents felt that too much time had been spent on it. However, most respondents rated the instruction they received as at least adequate and the language program, overall, can be considered to have been at least moderately successful. Individual site analyses will reveal considerable variation between sites with respect to satisfaction with language instruction, and Chapter IV, Discussion, will deal in greater depth with the issue

of time spent on language instruction.

Culture. The cultural component of the Second Language Institutes appears to have been the least successful component with respect to focusing exactly on what the students felt they needed. There was also wide variation between individual sites in their satisfaction ratings of the cultural components which will be dealt with in greater detail in section D of this chapter. Table 4 below shows participant responses to questions about the cultural instruction.

Table 4

Cultural Instruction - All Sites (N=146)

Time Devoted to Instruction		Instructional Methods	
Too little	21%	Boring	26%
About right	58%	Standard	42%
Too much	20%	Creative	31%
Instructional Content		**Instructors**	
Did not focus on needs	25%	Not good	12%
Adequate	57%	Adequate	33%
Focused exactly on needs	18%	Excellent	32%
		Varied/uneven	16%
		No formal inst.	5%

Clearly, most respondents found the cultural instruction to be at least adequate and, in that sense, the component must be considered moderately successful. However, fully one-fourth of the respondents rated the instructional content as poor and the

teaching methods as "boring" which leaves some room for improvement in this area.

Assessment. Table 5 displays all respondents' evaluations of the assessment component. Most notable among these findings are that almost one-third (32%) of the respondents felt too little time had been devoted to assessment instruction, and more people rated the instructional content as not focusing on their needs than felt it focused exactly on their needs. Analyses of individual sites and participant comments (Section III D) sheds further light on these findings.

Table 5

Assessment Instruction - All Sites (N=146)

Time Devoted to Instruction		Instructional Methods	
Too little	32%	Boring	19%
About right	51%	Standard	55%
Too much	14%	Creative	25%
Instructional Content		**Instructors**	
Did not focus on needs	29%	Not good	11%
Adequate	41%	Adequate	33%
Focused exactly on needs	28%	Excellent	36%
		Varied/uneven	17%

An additional interesting highlight of the responses is that more than one-third (36%) of the respondents rated the assessment instructors as "excellent." This is consistent with the other

categories of instruction: respondents appear to evaluate the curriculum independently of the instructors and are harsher critics of the curriculum than of the teachers.

Other. In an effort to determine if participation in the Second Language Institute program had had any real impact on participants' day-to-day work situation, we asked if their work role had changed at all since attending the institute. Only 14% reported an official role change. However, more than a third (37%) noted that their responsibilities had changed unofficially and that they were now assuming a more expanded role in working with Limited English Proficient children. Validation of this finding is also found in the supervisors' responses which are discussed in section F.

C. Analyses by Participant Background Characteristics

To determine if particular characteristics of the participants affected the way they evaluated the program or the kinds of needs or expectations they brought to the institute, cross tabulations of your major participant characteristics - sex, ethnicity, professional role, and number of years attending the program - and answers to key evaluation questions were run. Some interesting differences were found.

Sex. No significant differences were found for this variable. This may be due to the fact that none existed, or it may be due to an inability to pick up such differences since the sample was overwhelmingly female (77% to 23% male).

Ethnicity. It is well to keep in mind that the Second Language Institute participants were largely "Anglo," and that all others comprise only 25% of the responding sample. In absolute numbers there were 23 Hispanics, 3 Blacks, 7 Asians, and one "other" responding. Additionally, some institutes had very few minorities, and one - Fullerton - accounted for most of the Asians, resulting in the possibility of some confounding of findings. Hence, the reader is cautioned not to draw overly broad conclusions from this data. However, some findings are particularly interesting, especially when minority groups tend to respond in a singular voice.

1. Language Instruction. Hispanics were somewhat more likely to think that too much time had been devoted to language instruction (17% versus 4% for Anglos, 0% for Blacks and

0% for Asians). Without having any way of knowing for sure, we may speculate that these individuals were most likely to be the already fluent bilingual teachers. Both Hispanics (30%) and Blacks (100%) tended to be more satisfied with the content of language instruction, rating it as excellent, than the Anglos (21%).

2. Culture. Hispanics (48%) and Asians (33%) were much more likely to feel that too little time had been spent on cultural instruction than were Anglos (16%) or Blacks (0%). This is interesting since Hispanic and Asian cultures were targeted in the programs. One could speculate that since Hispanics and Asians are likely to know more about their own cultures, they may also notice the gaps in instruction more. Also interesting was the fact that with respect to evaluation of the content of instruction, Hispanics and Anglos looked very much alike - approximately one-third felt the instruction was at least adequate. We may draw the general conclusion that many Hispanics were saying the instruction was inadequate because it did not cover enough material, while the Anglos were more likely to feel the problem lay in the fact that the wrong things were covered.

3. Assessment. The most extreme, and least easy to explain, ethnic differences were found for the evaluation of the assessment component. More than half (52%) of the Hispanics and 40% of the Asians felt too little time had been devoted

to assessment, compared with only 29% of the Anglos and 0% of the Blacks. On the other hand, Hispanics and Blacks were much more satisfied with the instruction they received: 48% of Hispanics and 67% of Blacks stated that it focused exactly on their needs, compared to only 25% of Anglos and 0% of Asians.

Professional Role. Several interesting differences emerged with respect to the participants' professional roles that probably should be taken into account during the program planning phase of the institutes. The most consistent - and probably most important because of their numbers - differences were found between the school psychologists and the speech/language specialists.

1. Language. More than half (54%) of the school psychologists felt too little time had been devoted to language instruction, while only 29% of the speech/language specialists felt this to be the case. Resource specialists and bilinguals teachers were very satisfied with the time devoted to instruction with 85 and 80 percent respectively noting that it was at least adequate. On other measures of language instruction, significant differences between groups were not noted.
2. Culture. The only finding of particular interest here was that bilingual teachers, much more than any other group, wanted more cultural instruction. Forty percent noted that the time devoted to this component had been inadequate.
3. Assessment. Speech/language specialists were considerably

more inclined to want more time devoted to assessment than were the psychologists, with 40% and 23%, respectively, stating that too little time had been spent on this component. Bilingual teachers were most satisfied with time spent (80% said it was "about right"). All three school nurses in the sample felt the assessment component did not meet their needs, otherwise opinions on the quality of instruction were fairly even across professional groups, with the exception that bilingual teachers were very satisfied with instructional content; only 13% said it did not meet their needs.

To summarize: On the whole, bilingual teachers were most satisfied with the language and assessment components; their major complaint was that they would have liked more cultural instruction. Psychologists were most dissatisfied with the time spent on language instruction; they would have preferred more. Speech and language specialists wanted more of a focus on assessment than did other groups; and nurses found no use at all in the assessment component as it was organized.

Times attended. While the bulk of the participants were first time attendees (96 of 146) and relatively few were attending for the third time (11), some striking differences emerged between the groups. Theoretically, the second and third time participants should have a perspective on the institutes that would not be

shared by others, and this may be what is reflected in our findings. Also, people who have chosen to return to the program are probably a self-selected group of individuals who tend to be more satisfied with the program offerings - or they would not have returned. On the other hand, the differences in absolute numbers between the groups are sufficiently large to create an artifact in the findings which warrants caution in interpretation of the data.

1. Program Organization. Differences were found between these groups with respect to how they viewed program organization that were not encountered when we compared other background characteristics. Satisfaction with the language ability of other participants appears to increase with the number of times attending an institute. Only 57% of first-timers reported being satisfied with the linguistic skill level of their fellow students, while 63% of second-timers and 91% of the third-time attendees expressed such satisfaction. However, satisfaction with the number of fellow participants tended to decrease with time spent in the program: 27% of third-time participants felt there were too many people in the program, while only four and three percent of first and second-timers, respectively, had a similar complaint. Apparently, the longer in the program, the more some participants may wish for more individualized instruction.
2. Language. First time attendees tended to be considerably more satisfied with the amount of time that was devoted

to language instruction than were the other two groups. While 67% of the first timers felt it was "about right," nearly half (49% of second-timers and 46% of third-timers) wanted more time devoted to language instruction. Third-time attendees, on the other hand, were most satisfied with the content of the language instruction: none reported that it failed to focus on their needs while 28% of the first-time attendees felt this was the case.

3. Culture. Third-time attendees were also much more satisfied with the cultural instruction than were the other two groups: only nine percent of the third-timers felt the instruction did not focus on their needs as compared to 25% of second- and 29% of third-time attendees. With respect to their evaluation of the amount of time spent on cultural instruction there were no significant differences between the groups.

4. Assessment. Again, with respect to assessment instruction, third-time attendees tend to exhibit more satisfaction with the program than do the other groups. More than one-third of first and second-timers felt inadequate time had been devoted to assessment while only 9% of the third-timers shared this opinion. Eighty-two percent of the third-timers felt the time spent was "about right," while only 56% of first time attendees and 33% of second-time attendees agreed. With respect to instructional content, differences in opinion

were not substantial.

To Summarize: Third-time attendees (and to some lesser extent second-time attendees also) tend to be less critical of the program organization - perhaps because they have a better idea of what to expect. One suspects that they probably would not have returned if they were highly critical of the program. However, returnees do appear to be expressing a greater need for language instruction than for assessment or culture training. This should probably be taken into consideration in future program planning.

D. Analyses of Individual Sites[1]

1. California State University, Los Angeles - Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools

Participant Characteristics. Overall, respondents from the Cal State L.A. site were very much like the average of all respondents, with one exception: well over half (57%) of them had attended at least one institute in the past. This is compared to only 33% for all respondents. The reader will recall from earlier discussion that second-and third-time participants tended to evaluate their institute experience somewhat differently than did first time participants. Of course, it is not possible from these data to disentangle the portion of differences that may be attributed to the characteristic of being a repeat participant from the characteristics of the programs they attended, since a disproportionate number of repeaters attended two of the sites - Cal State L.A. and Guadalajara. However, it is still worthwhile to keep this participant characteristic in mind since respondents who have had previous experience with the institutes should, theoretically, have a broader base of knowledge from which to evaluate the effectiveness of the program they attended.

Program Organization. Participant respondents were generally very satisfied with the organization of this program, particularly

---

1 Frequency profiles for features of each of the sites can be found in Appendix D.

with the language and assessment instructional groupings. The overwhelming majority of respondents (83%) reported that they were satisfied with the language ability level of their fellow students, compared to 60% for all sites combined. (Language ability of participants tended to be uniformly higher than for several of the other institutes.) There was, however, one area of program organization that engendered considerable criticism: that was the scheduling of classes and classrooms. Participants complained that the course schedule was too choppy, being broken into hour slots, and much time was wasted traveling from room to room looking for the next course session. Many suggested that extending the duration of sessions and maintaining students in the same rooms would result in less confusion and better use of time.

Language. Overall, the language component of the program was rated higher than for any other institute. Although there was a high rate of response for this institute, almost no one criticized the language component as being ineffective. Half of the respondents rated the instructional methods as "creative" and 67% felt the staff was "excellent." The focus on terminology and specific content were cited by several participants as especially effective features of this component. The only criticism was that a substantial number (43%) would have liked to have had more time devoted to language instruction.

Culture. Respondents' evaluation of the cultural component

was very similar to the overall evaluation and hence could be considered moderately effective. The one exception was the fact that no one gave a low rating to the instructors in this area. Apparently the instructors were viewed as being superior to their curriculum.

Assessment. Most respondents (70% compared to 51% for the total sample) felt that the amount of time devoted to assessment instruction was "about right." And, while most respondents were at least moderately satisfied with the instruction they received, a substantial percentage (37%) rated the instructors of this component as "varied or uneven." An analysis of the participants' comments indicates that this was probably associated with some discontentment that the assessment component had overemphasized psychological assessment and underemphasized speech and language evaluation. Since the percentage of school psychologists and speech people was exactly equal, this imbalance in the curriculum was considered inappropriate by many.

Other. Among the program strengths that were noted by a number of respondents were (1) the use of role-playing and videotapes as methods of instruction; (2) the use of telephone tutors which some students found invaluable; and (3) the level of enthusiasm of the instructors in the program.

Only one additional criticism was leveled against the program and that was the inclusion of fluent bilingual teachers in the

language classes with other, less proficient, students. Several respondents felt that the needs of these individuals were very different from their own and there was a tendency to shift the appropriate focus of instruction, on occasion, away from a more central focus.

Program Ranking. The Cal State L.A. program was ranked highest of all institutes for its language instruction component and was also ranked among the highest for methods and instructional content in the assessment component. All other rankings were in the medium range.

2. National Hispanic University (NHU) - Guadalajara

Participant Characteristics. Background characteristics of the participants for the NHU institute were almost exactly parallel to the characteristics of all respondents. The outstanding feature of these participants was their high rate of response to the questionnaire. Response rate for this institute was 96%, rendering a high degree of reliability for the findings.

Program Organization. Participants responses to questions about program organization were also uniformly consistent with responses for the evaluation sample as a whole, reflecting an overall satisfaction with the way the program had been organized. The single criticism in this area which was voiced by a substantial number of respondents was that pre-testing for program placement was inadequate. Apparently several participants had to be moved from one language ability group to another because initial assess-

ment had been inaccurate. Many people expressed concern that valuable time had been lost and other participants' instruction adversely affected by improper placement of some participants.

Language. The most interesting finding about language instruction was the diversity of opinion about the quality of instructional content. Approximately one-third (31%) of respondents felt the language instruction was poor, another third (33%) rated it adequate and a final third (35%) felt it focused exactly on their needs. This may be related, in part, to the problems noted with placing participants into instructional groups. There was also some criticism that the instruction over-emphasized grammar at the expense of conversational practice.

Culture. Overall, the cultural component of the NHU program received a somewhat lower rating than all institutes combined. Forty-two percent of respondents (compared to just 25% for all institutes) felt the contest was inadequate and almost half (48%) rated instructional methods as boring. Twice as many participants in the NHU program (25%) as in all programs (12%) stated that the instructors of the cultural component were not good. This finding is interesting since the NHU program offers a cultural immersion as a highlight of the program's advantages and many participants selected it at least partially on that basis. Also interesting to note is the fact that there was overwhelming praise from participants for the involvement of local Mexican families. Apparently this aspect of the program was well organized and many students commented

that it had been the most instructive feature of the program. It appears that formal attempts at instructing about culture were less successful than the more informal method of living with a Mexican family.

Assessment. Nearly half (46%) of the respondents felt that too little time had been devoted to instruction of assessment techniques, however, the instruction that was offered was rated somewhat more highly than assessment instruction for all institutes. More than half (52%) reported that instructional content focused exactly on their needs, this compares to only 28% for all participants and a substantial number described the instruction as "creative." Instructors in this component were apparently highly regarded by the participants, with 69% reporting that they were excellent (compared to 36% for all groups). The participants' evaluation of the assessment component is also somewhat surprising since the institute director felt that this component was the least strong in the program. The director had cited a need for more "hands-on" experience with children. He also felt that the curriculum should be more standardized to incorporate a broader range of perspectives. This comment was made by staff members at other institutes as well, but NHU participants apparently did not feel the curriculum had been overly narrow. Yet the consistently high praise given to instructors and methods of instruction, in particular, leads us to the conclusion that participants' evaluations of the assessment component may have been more influenced by

the charismatic nature of the instructors than the actual curriculum content.

Program Ranking. Overall, the NHU institute received mixed reviews. The assessment component was ranked highest for all institutes, while the other two components fell into the medium range. There was, however, a surprising lack of consensus about the quality of the language instruction offered by the program with almost as many students reporting it was inadequate as those reporting it was excellent.

3. University of La Verne/Cal State San Bernardino-Cuernavaca

Participant Characteristics. Only 12 of the 19 participants in the program returned their questionnaires, for a total rate of return of 63%. This was one of the lowest return rates for all institutes. Of those participants responding it appears that there was a somewhat higher minority involvement in this institute than in most others. Thirty-three percent of respondents were Hispanic and 8% were Black. Otherwise respondents shared similar background characteristics to the study sample as a whole.

Program Organization. The only area in which participants at this site tended to differ substantiality from others was with respect to organization for assessment instruction. Forty-two percent of the respondents claimed they had not been grouped and an additional 17% felt that whatever groupings had occurred had been ineffective. Other criticisms of the assessment instruction included poor planning with respect to scheduling appointments to observe in local agencies

and too loosely structured assessment component. These criticisms are reflected in participants' evaluation of the assessment component.

Language. Overall, participants' views of content, methods and instructors in the component were consistent with the views of the total sample, that is, participants were generally quite satisfied. These respondents did differ with the group as a whole, though, in believing that the institute had done a particularly good job in alotting sufficient time to language instruction (83% reported time devoted was "about right" compared to 62% for the sample as a whole).

Culture. Respondents also appeared to be somewhat more satisfied with the cultural component of this program than were all respondents. No one reported the methods to be boring and only one person (8%) felt the instruction did not meet his or her needs. Additionally, the opportunity to live with a Mexican family and to take excursions around the site area were singled out by several respondents as particularly enriching cultural experiences.

Assessment. Overall, respondents were least satisfied with the assessment component and rated it lower than the combined ratings across institutes. Forty-two percent of these respondents (compared to 29% for all respondents) felt the instruction did not meet their needs and one-fourth of respondents rated instructors as poor (compared to 11% for all respondents). This should be considered alongside the finding that participants apparently were not grouped by background or profession for instruction.

Other. This site had a unique feature built into it that distinguished it from other programs - a series of follow-up workshops scheduled on a regular basis throughout the school year following the summer of 1982. Participants appeared to be excited by this innovation and preliminary comments suggested that some of the bugs in the assessment component were being worked out during the follow-up sessions. Several participants noted that the follow-up workshops were a particularly strong feature of the program.

Program Ranking. The La Verne program could most accurately be described as moderately successful overall, having received no outstandingly high or low rankings in any of its components, with the exception that participants ranked it number two for the amount of time devoted to language instruction.

4. California State University, Fullerton

Participant Characteristics. The Cal State Fullerton institute was a small project - only nine participants - that focused on Asian languages and culture. Seven studied Cantonese, three Vietnamese. Despite the fact there were few participants, all but one returned their questionnaires, so we can still have some confidence in our findings.

Participants in this program differed substantially from the overall sample with respect to background characteristics. There was only one male respondent, the majority of participants (63%) were Asians, and the largest professional category represented among respondents was "Bilingual teacher". Three-fourths of re-

spondents were attending a Second Language Institute for the first time, a slightly higher number than the overall sample.

Program Organization. There were also notable differences in these participants' views of the organization of the program. Thirty-eight percent felt the total length of the program (four weeks compared to six weeks for most others) was too short, and terribly intensive. Instruction lasted eight hours per day, and often included additional homework. Considerably fewer respondents felt the program's location (63% compared to 86% for all respondents) was very important. Apparently a substantial number of the participants attended the program because of what it was rather than where it was. In fact, for several participants the program's location was a hardship, necessitating long commutes, or living out of a trailer parked near the program's site during the week.

Language. Respondents' ratings of the language instruction component do not depart significantly from respondents' ratings for all institutes. One exception relates to the amount of variation in language ability among the participant groups. Sixty-three percent, compared to 25% for all respondents - stated that language ability of fellow students was too varied. The program's small size prevented much ability grouping, instead individualized instruction was emphasized. Given the number of participants, all students learning Cantonese worked in one group and the three students studying Vietnamese had their own group.

Otherwise, Cal Fullerton's respondents were notably uncritical

of the language instruction. None rated the instructional methods as boring, or the instructors as poor. On the other hand, these participants were also somewhat less laudatory with only 25% reporting that the methods used were "creative". Instructors were, however, rated relatively high with 63% of respondents giving them an "excellent" rating (compared to 43% for all respondents).

During one site visit, students indicated particularly enjoying the daily on-site lunch with their instructors. It provided an opportunity for one additional hour of language practice, as well as informal "shop-talk".

Culture. Respondents' ratings of the cultural component closely paralleled those of the language component, with little overt criticism of the program. Most participants appeared to feel the instruction was at least adequate, although half of these respondents (compared to 21% for all respondents) believed too little time was devoted to cultural instruction. Discussion of culture and its relevance to assessment and language was interspersed throughout the instructional day. In addition, visits to local Chinese and Vietnamese community resources, from markets to social service centers took place. An effort was made to introduce students to available Asian resources they could call on at a future time.

Assessment. Sixty-three percent of respondents evaluated the assessment content as "adequate" and 75% felt instructional methods were "standard". Few participants rated the assessment

component poorly or exceptionally good. Assessment instruction included two practica at a local elementary school, and fifteen hours of lectures by a variety of consultants with expertise in some aspect of assessment. The general instructional philosophy was that Asian resources related to assessing LEP kids are very scarce, there is a lack of formal instruments, and professionals often have to improvise, use informal assessment techniques and observation, and share locally developed tests. The assessment sessions tried to expose participants to professional experts working with Asians.

Other. Participants appear to have been satisfied with the instruction they received, while believing there was still some room for improvement, particularly with respect to the amount of time devoted to cultural instruction.

Program Rankings. Cal State Fullerton's program received high ratings for time devoted to language and language instructors. Both the cultural component and the assessment component fell within the medium range, indicating a moderately successful program. The institute received only one low ranking and this was for total length of program. Participants felt the program was too short (4 weeks) to adequately cover the material.

5. University of the Pacific (UOP) - Stockton

Participant Characteristics. Background characteristics of these participants were similar to those of all respondents. However, ratings of this program were characterized by extremes

in reactions to the three instructional components. And since the response rate was fairly high (79%), some confidence may be placed in the findings.

Program Organization. The single most outstanding departure from other institutes is the finding that 82% of participants felt the daily length of the program was too long. Indeed, the UOP program had scheduled the lengthiest day - 8:30-5:30 - of any of the programs and offered the greatest total number of hours of instruction. While the objective of the program planners - to offer a highly intensive experience - is certainly admirable, the participants may not have been able to take full advantage of the program offerings due to over-saturation.

There were also a number of comments by participants noting general problems in planning, organization, and division of time between components. Several participants felt the coordinator had not been receptive to participants' concerns in this area.

Language. The language component of this institute was rated very low. Eighty-two percent of respondents felt the instruction did not focus on their needs and the methods used were "boring." Seventy-three percent of the respondents rated the instructor as "not good." Numerous comments were made by participants about the methods being too "traditional," with an over-emphasis on the text-book - conjugation of verbs, etc. - and lack of opportunity to use the language in a meaningful way. It was also noted that some students' second language skills were so low that other students

were held back. The suggestion was made that a separate grouping of these students would have facilitated learning for all.

Culture. The cultural component of this program, on the other hand, was rated extremely high. Eighty-two percent of the respondents reported that instruction focused exactly on their needs; 91% of respondents rated the methods of instruction as creative and the instructor as excellent. Additionally, an innovation which was introduced at this site that brought together Hispanic Migrant students with program participants for lunchtime discussions was noted by several respondents as being particularly enlightening.

Assessment. The assessment component was rated very similarly to the assessment components for all institutes combined. Eighty percent of the respondents rated it at least adequate. However, another interesting innovation had been introduced at this site that received some mention by respondents. Participants were provided the opportunity to work fairly extensively in a nearby elementary school with migrant children who had been referred for special education evaluation. This provided the participants with the unique opportunity to "try out" the assessment skills they were learning on students exactly like the ones they would encounter daily in the San Joaquin Valley where the bulk of the program participants were located.

Other. It is worth emphasizing that although this program received rather mixed reviews, it attempted to gear its program to

the specific population - migrant students - that the participants were most likely to encounter in their jobs. In this respect the institute offered a model for instruction that should not be overlooked in future program planning.

Program Ranking. The UOP institute holds the unique distinction of having both a highest ranked component - culture - and a lowest ranked component - language. The assessment component also ranked relatively high, with instructional content and methods being rated number three of all institutes and instructors number two.

6. San Diego County Department of Education - Cal State San Diego

Participant Characteristics. Compared to the overall sample average, a higher percentage of the San Diego program respondents were male (50% vs. 16%), and school psychologists by profession (50% versus 30%), and a slightly higher than average were attending a second language institute for the first time. As previously discussed, these personal characteristics may affect participant expectations and evaluations of the program. The San Diego program participants exhibited the second lowest response rate to the evaluation questionnaire and assigned their program the lowest overall ratings for instructional components. While 43% of all participants did not return questionnaires, thus requiring some caution in interpreting results, the responses of those who did return questionnaires show consistency with each other, as well as with the opinions students expressed during the site visit.

Program Organization. While participants felt generally sat-

isfied with the number of fellow participants, their professional composition; and instructional groupings, many expressed feelings of disharmony between the staff and participants. In analyses of written and verbal comments, they expressed a need for the program to be in the hands of special education personnel, not bilingual education specialists, citing that the latter did not understand student needs, undervalued their skills, and presented assessment and culture materials lacking depth, sophistication, and theoretical basis.

Language. Eighty-eight percent of respondents felt too little time (three hours per day, or 50% of program time) was devoted to language instruction. Use of the Spanish language was confined to formal instructional time, an assessment and culture lectures were conducted primarily in English. Respondents could not agree on the quality of instruction offered. Almost equal numbers of participants rated instructional content as poor or as excellent. Similarly, equal numbers rated instructors poor, adequate, excellent, or varied. During the site visit, students in the beginning and intermediate language groups indicated being generally pleased with the program and their progress in it although advanced students complained language training materials at their level were incomplete, or not yet developed. Some dissatisfaction with the language training program stemmed from personal conflict between one of the Spanish instructors and her students.

Culture. Though formally accounting for only approximately

20% of instructional time, a very high percentage (88%) of respondents felt too much time was devoted to culture instruction in the program. This is probably related to the finding that 75% felt instructional methods were "boring." Sixty-three percent reported that the content did not focus on their needs and half rated their instructors as poor. Students expressed disappointment that the program had not taken advantage of more local resources available in San Diego, and the nearby Mexican towns. During our site visit, many commented they felt instructors lacked sophistication, condescended to students, and failed to acknowledge considerable student expertise about Mexican-American culture and problems.

Assessment. The assessment component was also rated very low. All respondents reported that the instructional content did not focus on their needs and all but one respondent (88%) reported that the teaching methods were "boring." Fifty percent of respondents rated the instructors as "not good;" the other half reported the instructors as varied or uneven in performance. Diverging perceptions of participant competence may have marred the assessment segment. Students felt they were experienced in assessing LEP children, and many were already called upon to conduct assessment on the job. The assessment staff, on the other hand, felt many of the participants' Spanish language proficiency and cultural sensitivity level needed heightening before being allowed to assess real students. Further, participants felt they would have been better served by a staff member familiar with the Mexican-American

experience in California. Respondents perceived that the background and experience of the assessment component instructor did not match their needs. They worked and were familiar with Mexican-American students in California; the instructor's experience was on the East Coast with other Hispanic gorups.

Other. While generally satisfied with the Hispanic Training Institute's approach to Spanish instruction at the beginning and intermediate levels, students were disappointed with other aspects of the program. Due to management problems, the program did not deliver some of the things it promised. For example, an assessment practicum, use of San Diego and nearby Mexican resources. Students noted lack of cohesiveness, no interaction among staff and students outside the class as weaknesses. Spanish instructors finished their shift at 11:30 a.m., and did not stay to have lunch and informally practice Spanish with their students, something which students felt enhanced student-staff relations, and contributes to language acquisition in other sites.

Program Ranking. Both the culture and assessment components of this program were ranked lowest overall for all institutes. Additionally, the overall length of the program was given a low rating (one quarter felt it was too long) and the amount of time devoted to language instruction was also ranked low - participant respondents felt too little time was spent here. The program did receive one relatively high ranking; it was rated number three for language instructional methods.

(7-9) Cal State Fresno

There were three program sites - Tulare, Stanislaus, and Fresno - under the same directorship and general structure. However, since each site had different staff they apparently varied considerably. Hence each site has been treated as a separate institute for purposes of evaluation.

7. Tulare site.

Background characteristics of the participants in the Tulare program differed somewhat from participants in general: almost all participants were female (91% of respondents), all were Anglo, and 62% were resource specialists. There were no school psychologists and only two speech/language specialists - the two largest professional categories represented at the other institutes. Three-fourths of participants were attending their first institute.

Program Organization. The Tulare Second Language Training Institute was part of a HILT (High Intensity Language Training Program) run by the Tulare County Department of Education. All instruction took place on site, at a large, modular building housing County Education offices. Institute participants were grouped according to language ability, and they joined together three times per week, for 45 minute lectures and discussions of assessment issues. All of the 4-weeks-long, 7-hours-a-day program was taught in Spanish and since a Mexican-style lunch was included as part of the program, students and staff had the opportunity to informally practice Spanish during the lunch break.

Language. Tulare County has several years experience conducting HILT programs for bilingual teachers. Respondents were generally quite satisfied with the language instruction component, and cited the Spanish immersion approach requiring participants to speak Spanish all day long, as one of the program's strong points. All but one respondent felt that the time devoted to instruction was "about right" and 82% felt the instructional methods were creative and held students' interests. However, 50% of respondents rated the instructors as varied or uneven.

Culture. The culture component was not taught separately, but integrated throughout the program. For instance, cultural issues affecting testing were discussed during assessment lectures.

During the site visit, students indicated they considered themselves quite knowledgeable and experienced about the Central Valley's Mexican-American and Mexican students and families they worked with, but virtually all respondents found the instruction and teachers at least adequate, and 82% felt the amount of time devoted to instruction "about right."

Assessment. Institute students participated in 45 minute assessment lectures and discussion three times per week. While the strand was taught in Spanish, it included no assessment practica using real students. Most respondents felt the assessment instruction as well as instructional staff were adequate.

Some respondents suggested that more time be devoted to the assessment component, and a better job of assessing participants'

abilities for purposes of groupings be done.

Program ranking. The program received the highest ranking for time devoted to language instruction and instructional methods used to teach language. Overall, it was ranked very closely to the number one language component - Cal State L.A. Both the culture and assessment components fell in the medium range for all institutes.

8. Stanislaus Site.

A shortened observation period and a relatively small number of respondents, (who were frugal with their comments) combine to create a picture of the Stanislaus site that is somewhat more sketchy than those of the other institutes. We have had to rely more exclusively on the quantitative data to understand this program than has been necessary for other sites.

Participant Characteristics. Of those participants responding, there were several significant departures from the "typical" participant profile. More respondents were male (one-third compared to 23% for all institutes combined); all respondents were Anglo; all but one were first-time attendees, and while most other occupational categories were represented, there were no speech/language specialists among the responding group. With the exception of sex, this group of respondents tended to be more homogeneous than respondents from other sites.

Program Organization. With respect to general organization of the program, one-third of the respondents felt the language ability level of other participants was too low (compared to only 7% for all

institutes) and there apparently was no grouping of participants for purposes of assessment instruction. Thirty-three percent reported that the grouping of participants - such as it was - was ineffective (compared to 16% for all institutes).

Language. There was little criticism of the language component, almost all participants found instruction at least adequate and 68% (compared to 36% for all institutes) rated the instructional methods as creative and interesting. Several respondents commented favorably on the Spanish immersion atmosphere that had been created.

Culture. Almost all respondents felt the amount of time devoted to cultural instruction was "about right" and all rated the instructional content, methods, and staff at least adequate with 67% rating the instructors as excellent. Overall, the culture component appears to have been among the most successful of the institutes. However, no specific comments were made by respondents about the features of this component that they found particularly attractive.

Assessment. The assessment component of this institute appears to have been the least successful of the three major components. More than half of the respondents felt that too little time was devoted to assessment instruction and 44% and 33% respectively rated the instructional content as poor and the teaching methods as boring (compared to 29% and 19% for all institutes). Respondents' statements about the assessment component, however, tended to be vague, without specific mention of its weak points.

Program Ranking. Generally, all three components of the

Stanislaus program fell within the medium range - neither outstandingly good nor outstandingly poor. However, respondents did rank both language instructional methods and cultural instructors as number two among all sites.

9. Fresno State University Site

Participant Characteristics. Since only 50% of program participants responded to the survey, findings for this Institute must necessarily be interpreted with some caution. The background characteristics of the responding participants did not differ markedly from those of all respondents in the study. However, slightly higher percentages than program averages were female, Anglo, and first time institute attendees. Most were from districts in and around Fresno, and worked primarily with Mexican and Mexican-American LEP students.

Fresno's respondents included much higher than average numbers of speech therapists (50% versus 29% for the sample average), lower numbers of school psychologists (12% versus 30%), and no bilingual teachers.

Program Organization. The Institute was housed in classrooms at the Fresno State University campus, and included no off-site activities or assessment practica. Fresno's Second Language Institute was jointly administered with a HILT (High Intensity Language Training) program for bilingual teachers interested in learning Spanish.

A total of about fifty students were grouped by language ability - sixteen of these were Institute participants - four days a week. On

the fifth day, Institute participants regrouped to discuss assessment issues. Non-Institute participants received instruction in bilingual teaching methods at this time.

Staff and students were expected to have lunch together in the student cafeteria in order to practice Spanish. But, since the lunch facility is open to the public, it is quite noisy, and not conducive to private conversation.

There were some substantial differences in the way these participants viewed the general organization of the program. Only half of the respondents agreed that either the total or daily length of the program (4 weeks, 7 hours each day) was appropriate. One-quarter felt the program was too short, and another fourth felt it was too long. Thirty-seven percent of these respondents (compared to 18% for all respondents) were dissatisfied with the professional composition of their fellow participants. It was also interesting to note that half of these respondents felt there were insufficient staff to adequately cover instruction (this compared to 21% for all respondents).

Language. Respondents rated language instruction at the Fresno site very similarly as for all institutes, although instructors were rated somewhat higher (63% excellent) than instructors for all institutes (43% excellent).

A number of students interviewed during the site visit indicated acquisition of the Spanish language was their primary goal in enrolling in the Institute, the assessment and culture components

secondary. The entire Fresno program, including lectures on assessment was conducted in Spanish.

Culture. Half of respondents felt that too much time was devoted to cultural instruction and none of the respondents felt that the instructional content focused exactly on their needs, though 75% felt it was adequate. Overall, the content and methods of instruction for this component were rated a little lower than for all institutes.

Discussions of culture were included as part of the language and assessment components, with primary attention focused on the Mexican-American experience in the Central Valley. During our site visit, students indicated they were already familiar with much of the culture material discussed, as they had years of experience working with Mexican-American students and families.

Assessment. Only 12% of the respondents felt the amount of time devoted to assessment instruction was appropriate. Three-quarters of the respondents reported that the instructional content did not focus on their needs and 63% rated the methods of instruction as boring. Half of respondents evaluated the instructors of this component as varied and uneven.

Several students commented on the need to provide assessment training particular to the needs of speech/language people rather than mixing them in with psychologists.

Other. The program's guiding philosophy was to increase the Spanish proficiency of a varied group of school professionals, and

to provide practical experience in the use of special education terms in Spanish. During the site visit, both students and staff suggested restructuring the schedule so as to better integrate the assessment and culture segments with language instruction.

Program Ranking. Overall, respondents felt the language instruction was moderately successful, while cultural instruction was rated slightly lower than for all institutes. The assessment component was viewed as generally unsuccessful; respondents gave it the lowest ranking of all institute programs in the study.

E. Supervisor Response Rates

Not all participant respondents offered the name of a supervisor to be contacted. This was despite the fact that we did not require the participant to identify him/herself and the nominator's name was never used in communication with the supervisor. Of the 146 questionnaires returned, 113 supervisors' names and addresses were provided. (Some people gave names but inadequate addresses.) And, of this group, 81 people returned questionnaires for an overall response rate of 72%. As with the participant questionnaires, reminder notices were unsuccessful in raising the response rate significantly. The table below graphically displays supervisor rates by site.

Table 6

Site	# Supervisors Receiving questionnaires	% Respondents Providing Supervisor Name	# of Supervisors Returning Questionnaires	% of Supervisors Returning Questionnaires
Site				
Cal State L.A.	23	77%	14	61%
NHU - Guadalajara	36	83%	31	83%
La Verne-Cuern.	10	83%	9	90%
Cal State-Fullerton	6	100%	6	100%
U.O.P.	9	82%	6	67%
San Diego	4	50%	2	50%
Tulare	11	92%	5	45%
Stanislaus	8	89%	5	63%
Fresno	6	75%	3	50%
Total	113	89%	81	72%

As indicated in Table 5 wide variation in response rates as well as absolute numbers of respondents rendered any analysis of responses by site meaningless. Additionally, 16% of those supervisors returning questionnaires stated that they were unaware that anyone under their supervision had ever participated in a Second Language Institute and hence could not comment on the effectiveness of the program. For these reasons we decided the most productive use of the supervisor data would be in the aggregate.

F. Analyses of Supervisor Questionnaires

The Supervisor questionnaires consisted of eight closed questions and three open-ended questions (Appendix A). The first question asked whether the Supervisor was aware if anyone under his/her supervision had participated in a Second Language Institute (SLI). Assumedly, if the supervisor was not aware of this, it would be difficult to evaluate the impact of the program on his/her staff. This question was asked as a "screen" to make sure that responses would, indeed, be based on some knowledge of the program or a program participant. Thirteen people - 16% of the respondents - returned questionnaires stating they were unaware that anyone under their supervision had participated in the program and consequently they were unable to respond meaningfully to our questions. This left a sample of 68 usable questionnaires with one incomplete. Therefore, responses are calculated on a sample of 67 or 68 questionnaires.

Three questions were oriented toward improvement in targeted skills in the Second Language Institute participants. The first of these questions dealt with improvement in second language skills, the second with improvement in assessment skills, and the third with an increase in ability to communicate with parents and community members. Table 7 displays Supervisor responses to these three questions.

Table 7

Supervisors' Response to Skill Improvement of Participants

Skills	N	Yes(%)	No(%)	Don't Know(%)	No Response(%)
Language	67	53(79%)	4(6%)	10 (15%)	1 (1%)
Assessment	68	53(78%)	4(6%)	10 (15%)	1 (1%)
Communication w/parents/comm.	67	42(63%)	5(7%)	17(25%)	3 (4%)

As indicated in Table 7, among those supervisors responding, the great majority stated that there was noticeable improvement in both language and assessment skills of the program participants, and well over half (63%) reported that ability to communicate with parents and community members had also increased. Perhaps most significant, however, were the very small percentages (6-7%) of supervisors who reported seeing no improvement. Since it is understandable that many supervisors would not actually have occasion to see the participant utilizing all the skills mentioned (particularly communicating with parents) the "Don't Know" response is a reasonable answer and probably reflects a real lack of opportunity to observe the skill improvement. Hence, if we take the "No" category as a valid reflection of participants' failure to improve, we must conclude that the programs were enormously successful as far as the responding supervisors were concerned.

A fourth question asked if supervisors had been able to increase responsibilities on the participants. In other words, are they now able to take over tasks they could not previously

perform? This, of course, is a measure of the practical usefulness of the program for a school district. A follow-up open-ended question asked in what ways responsibilities had been increased. Table 8 shows supervisors' responses to the question of whether responsibilities had been increased.

Table 8

Increased Responsibility on Participant

N	Yes (%)	No (%)	Other Response (%)
67	45 (67%)	21 (31%)	2 (3%)

As noted in the table above, two-thirds of the respondents reported that they had, indeed, increased the responsibilities of the Second Language Institute participants. Among those reporting "No" and the two "Other Responses" there were several comments to the effect that the individual's work role did not allow for such an increase in responsibility, though the person was clearly more competent doing what he/she had been doing all along. With respect to the ways in which participant responsibilities had been increased. two things were mentioned with very high frequency: (1) participants were now being used as consultants to other psychologists, schools, and districts, and providing special in-services; and (2) participants were being used increasingly as the primary communication link between home and school.

Another question on the survey form asked if supervisors were better able to comply with legal requirements as a result of having

institute-trained personnel on Staff. Not all participants are involved in legally mandated assessment in their districts so we would not even strive for a 100% affirmative response to this question, however, it remains an issue of critical importance for many schools and districts. Table 9 presents the responses to this question.

Table 9

Increased Compliance With Legal Requirements

N	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)	Other (%)	No Responses (%)
67	52 (78%)	10 (15%)	3 (4%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)

Considering the limitations of the question, the number of supervisors answering "Yes" to this question is rather extraordinary. Apparently, there is a widespread belief that the Second Language Institutes are making a significant impact on the ability of schools and districts to meet legal mandates.

The next question asked of the supervisors was whether or not it has been "helpful" to have a Second Language Institute-trained person on staff. The rationale behind this question was that participants may not always be given added responsibilities or be involved directly in meeting legal assessment requirements, but they may still be more useful to their districts in ways which we have not considered. For this reason, a follow-up explanation was requested. Table 10 indicates supervisor responses to the question of helpfulness.

Table 10

SLI Participant Helpfulness

N	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)	Other (%)	No Response (%)
68	57 (84%)	6 (9%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)

Overwhelmingly, supervisors reported that it was helpful to them to have such a person on their staff. Among the various ways in which participants were judged helpful were: helping to develop better programs for LEP students, increasing in-house assessments, giving the district more confidence, motivating others to develop similar skills, interpreting students' needs, communicating with parents, and providing a better understanding of IEP's for LEP children.

The penultimate question of the survey asked if supervisors felt that the State of California should continue to provide Second Language Institutes. Responses to this question are displayed below in Table 11.

Table 11

Should Program Be Continued by State?

N	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)	No Response (%)
67	62 (93%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)

As indicated by Table 11, there is extremely strong support for continuance of this program on the part of responding supervisors. It is interesting that even some supervisors who did not

report noticeable improvements in participants on their staff, felt the program should be continued. Analyses of supervisor comments leads us to the conclusion that, in some cases, supervisors felt the particular participant from their staff was not an especially good candidate for the program, but these feelings did not carry over to evaluation of the program.

The final question asked of supervisors was open-ended and simply provided an opportunity to comment on anything that had not already been covered. Naturally, many people did not respond specifically to this question. However, among those who did, the single highest frequency response was a simple, hearty endorsement of the program. A few people mentioned the cost of the program - either that it was too expensive for the participants or querying about what the cost might be to the state. Also mentioned were the need to select participants more carefully; an appeal to include administrators, institute a follow-up, and provide lists of program participants available for employment.

In summary, among those supervisors who responded to the questionnaire, there was enthusiastic endorsement of the Second Language Institutes and very positive ratings for skill improvement of program participants. Of course, a question remains about how representative these supervisors were of all participants' supervisors since approximately one-third of participants did not nominate a supervisor (in some cases the request was

non-applicable or addresses were erroneous or inadequate), and not all nominated supervisors responded to our queries. However, since we cannot know how other supervisors might have responded, the most significant statement we can make, given the data we have to work with, is that more than half of all participants' supervisors are known to be strongly in favor of the program based on their experience with institute-trained personnel.

IV DISCUSSION

A. Successful Program Features

The central theme of this evaluation study was to identify those features of the Second Language Institutes that were particularly successful in transmitting targeted skills to program participants. Three skill areas were emphasized by the institutes - language, culture, and assessment of LEP children. For each of these skill areas - or program components - we have identified four sub-components that were deemed important for the acquisition of the targeted material. These are (1) the time devoted to the component; (2) instructional content; (3) instructional methods; and (4) staff (instructors). In addition to the three program components, the general organization of the institute as well as program philosophy are also important elements that contribute to a successful program and will be discussed in this section.

The method by which we have isolated particularly successful program features was discussed in Chapter II, Methods. Suffice it to say here that features identified in the Program Feature Profiles (Appendix B) are matched with program rankings listed in Table 12 below to yield a picture of those characteristics of programs that appear to have met with greatest success.

Language

1. Time devoted to language instruction. Very few people felt that too much time had been devoted to language instruction, and though the "official" percentage of time devoted to language instruction differed considerably

Table 12

Program Rankings

Highly Ranked Programs

Language		
	Time Devoted	(1) Tulare (2) La Verne (3) Fullerton
	Instructional Content	(1) Cal State L.A.
	Instructional Methods	(1) Tulare (2) Stanislaus (3) Cal State LA/San Diego
	Instructors	(1) Cal State L.A. (2) Fullerton/Fresno
Culture		
	Time Devoted	(1) UOP (2) Stanislaus
	Instructional Content	(1) UOP
	Instructional Methods	(1) UOP
	Instructors	(1) UOP (2) Stanislaus
Assessment		
	Time Devoted	(1) Cal State L.A.
	Instructional Content	(1) NHU (2) Cal State L.A. (3) UOP
	Instructional Methods	(1) NHU (2) Cal State L.A. (3) UOP
	Instructors	(1) NHU (2) UOP

for the three highest ranking sites - Tulare, La Verne, and Fullerton - (from 45-90% of total program time) there was an apparent commonality between the sites which may have led to these high ratings by participants. Both Tulare and La Verne provided a language immersion approach - Tulare by virtue of its HILT methodology and La Verne because students were physically immersed in the language in Mexico. The Fullerton program may have been viewed as successful in this area on the basis of very different criteria since its focus was Asian languages and most participants were not highly skilled in the second language. The fact that groups were small and a great deal of one-to-one contact with the instructor was possible probably contributed to the high degree of satisfaction that these participants exhibited.

The main unanswered question here is why other immersion-type programs - including those like Cal State L.A. that were very successful otherwise - did not produce the same degree of satisfaction with respect to time spent on instruction. Perhaps to some extent it may be valid to conclude that the better the language program was, the more time students wanted to spend in it. The goal of stating with precision how much time is optimum for language instruction remains elusive, however, our analyses of both comments and quantitative

data lead us to conclude that students preferred highly integrated language programs where the target language was utilized throughout the day in an immersion-type setting. However, as noted, this probably would differ somewhat for languages other than Spanish.

2. Instructional content. With respect to instructional content, no other institute even came close to matching the success of the Cal State L.A. program, hence only one institute is ranked. The instructors in the Cal State program have now had three years to develop a curriculum for the program and that time to experiment with and modify their curriculum appears to have paid off. Several features are fundamental to their approach. Assessment and culture curricula are carefully woven into the language instruction component by utilizing these subject areas as bases for language instruction. A particular aspect of this is the strong emphasis on introducing special education and assessment terminology into the language instruction: while substantial time is spent on discussion of grammatical features of the language, the emphasis of the curriculum is on conversational experience utilizing concepts and terms that special education personnel will need in their work situations. The immersion approach of the program also provides extensive listening as well as speaking experience for the students.

3. Instructional methods. The highest ranking sites with respect to instructional methods were all immersion-type programs with the exception of San Diego. Both Tulare and Stanislaus employed a HILT methodology which emphasizes a fast-paced bombardment of the senses in a naturalistic setting. Instructional methods employed by the Cal State L.A. site included a good deal of role-playing and videotaping. An additional innovation was the use of telephone tutors who were used both for additional conversational experience and to clarify any linguistic issues that had been encountered during the day. This was apparently quite successful and allowed the program to maintain a more rapid pace since minor questions could be dealt with on a one-to-one basis with the tutor. Also, instructors had planned for separate lessons on grammatical points, geared towards the differing skill levels of the students, so that conversations and other experientially-oriented language instruction were not hampered by the need to go off on lengthy grammatical explanations.

4. Instructors. The highest rated language instructors were found at the Cal State L.A., Fullerton, and Fresno sites. The single most often used adjective to describe good language instructors was "enthusiasm." Students seemed to appreciate teachers who maintained a quick-

paced, optimistic attitude toward their teaching. Accessibility was another feature of the highly rated instructors. Students wanted to feel that instructors were available informally as well as during formal class time.

Culture

1. Time devoted to culture instruction. Only two institutes were perceived to be highly successful in the area of culture instruction - UOP and Stanislaus and in both cases instructors appear to have been key to the experience. The UOP culture component was segregated from the other two components and officially accounted for 20% of the total instructional time. The Stanislaus site sought to integrate the cultural component into the total program and did not allot it any particular amount of time. This wide variation in approach to time allotment for the cultural component emphasizes the fact that students' satisfaction with the time devoted to this instruction was more a function of overall satisfaction with the component than with actual time spent in study.

2.&3. Instructional content/methods. The UOP program stood out far above all others in both content and methods of instruction of culture. The component was taught by one very charismatic instructor, however, he used a multi-method approach to convey his material. The general

curriculum consisted of an historical approach to Hispanic culture and its roots in the U.S. The instructor was concerned with conveying to students how the Mexican and the Mexican-American had come to occupy the social and economic roles that they do today. Readings, art, film, music, were all used as tools of instruction. While some discussion was conducted on the differences among contemporary Hispanic groups, the emphasis was more on understanding how things had come to be as they are, than on discussion of present day characteristics of the target population. This emphasis appears to have avoided the pitfall encountered by other programs that were criticized for being condescending to the students. Since most SLI participants chose to attend an institute because they were already working with - and hence familiar with - a particular minority population, they felt they knew quite a bit about their characteristics as a group. What they seemed to appreciate learning about were the underlying factors that help to explain the behaviors and characteristics they have witnessed. An additional innovation of the UOP program was arranged lunches for participants and migrant students. Many participants noted that they appreciated the opportunity to have very frank discussions with these students about their life experiences and this provided new insights for

the participants.

4. Instructors. UOP and Stanislaus were ranked highest for the quality of their instructional staff. Stanislaus, unlike UOP, used several different instructors and called upon student resources to teach cultural material. However, perhaps more important for this component than the others, was the likeableness - or the charisma - of the instructors. Since instructors for the cultural components were generally representatives of the culture, the degree to which students related to them appears to have been the key factor in their ability to get their message across. Personality features which appear to have contributed to this success included openness, a lack of condescension, enthusiasm about the material to the extent that they displayed a real desire for the students to enjoy it, and a sincere interest in students' beliefs and perceptions.

Assessment

1. Time devoted to instruction. Only one institute was rated particularly high in this area: Cal State L.A. Because an attempt had been made to integrate the assessment and language components to some extent, and because the scheduling of classes was so complex, it was difficult to quantify the amount of time devoted to assessment instruction with great precision. However,

best estimates put it at between 25% and 55% depending on the level of Spanish language ability of the student. Cal State L.A. was one of two sites that attempted to vary language and assessment instructional time according to the linguistic skills of the participants. Both from the comments made by participants at various sites and the ratings that this institute received, it appears that this may be a successful strategy. However, it is interesting to note that the institute director had specifically mentioned that he felt a point of dissatisfaction on the part of the students was that too much time was spent on assessment; they preferred that the time be spent on language instruction. Judging from the questionnaire results it is true that participants wanted more time devoted to language, but apparently they were not consistent in wanting the time taken away from assessment.

2.&3. Instructional content and methods. Overall, the NHU site was the highest ranked institute for the assessment component, with Cal State L.A. ranking number two and UOP number three; these rankings held for both instructional content and methods. Interestingly, the features that made these components outstanding in the minds of participants appear to have differed considerably among the three sites. The NHU program focused on introducing instruments and techniques, providing demonstration and

role-playing opportunities to practice their administration. The instructor for this component is an acknowledged expert in the area and apparently was successful in transmitting a great deal of information on the topic. The Cal State L.A. program offered some use of materials in school settings in addition to lecture and demonstration in the institute classroom. The assessment component was integrated, to some extent, into other aspects of the curriculum, and several instructors were responsible for this component. There was also a good attempt at providing specialized training for the speech/language specialists that dealt with issues particular to their specialty. The UOP program had the most hands-on emphasis with students working daily for a period of one to two weeks with Spanish-speaking special education referred children. This experience was preceded by lecture and demonstration of materials and participants were monitored during test administration. However, since many students were all working at once it was impossible for the instructor to monitor them as closely as might have been helpful. This program also offered a separate section of the assessment component for speech/language specialists and this appeared to parallel the psychological assessment, however there was little specific comment on this instruction by the participants.

4. Instructors. Instructors for the two institutes that ranked highest - NHU and UOP - were considerably different with respect to background and philosophy. What they appeared to have in common was a sincere interest in the students and an attitude of accessibility. The NHU instructor is a specialist in assessment of Spanish speaking children, a university professor, and is partial to a particular set of instruments and techniques. The UOP psychological assessment instructor is a practicing school psychologist with a much more eclectic approach to instruments and techniques as was the speech/language specialist. Students' comments about the instructors were more centered around the personality characteristics of the individual at NHU and the delivery of the instruction at UOP.

Program Philosophy. One major issue in program philosophy which which we found to be critical to the success of an institute was Who taught whom? Since the participants in the program are all individuals with a certain amount of expertise in at least some of the content areas covered, they have a legitimate expectation that their instructors will be more knowledgeable than they in those areas, in addition to having expertise in areas not so familiar to students. There is also an expectation that instruction will be geared to the students' particular professional needs. Unfortunately these

expectations were not always met. In some of the less successful institutes there were complaints that the directors were not themselves sufficiently knowledgeable about the content areas and as a result were unreceptive to students who voiced dissatisfaction with the curriculum. There was also concern expressed that psychologists were able to offer little to speech/language specialists and bilingual educators had no business at all teaching special education people about special education topics. Also mentioned was the inappropriateness of having teachers whose knowledge was based on Hispanic (or Asian) groups that differed considerably in speech and cultural habits from those Hispanics served in California.

In summary, participants made it clear that they preferred California-based Mexican-Spanish-speaking instructors who were knowledgeable about the students' particular specialty and who displayed an attitude that they were teaching peers, not undergraduate students. Likewise, participants wanted program directors who were knowledgeable about all aspects of the program, open, and flexible to change if things were not working out.

A second area of concern mentioned frequently by respondents was that of over-emphasis on psychological assessment to the exclusion of other specialties. If people other than psychologists - and especially speech and language specialists - are to continue to be included in the program, then students would like to see a broadening of the assessment curriculum to accommodate their needs. Nurses felt the assessment curriculum did not focus on their needs

at all. Bilingual teachers were more split on the issue and speech people often felt they had been shortchanged. There is an apparent need to broaden the philosophy of the assessment component to encompass the range of needs of the students.

Program Organization. There were more criticisms - and suggestions for improvements - of program organization than any other aspect of the institutes.

All of the institutes that had attempted to cut back on the six week program period were criticized by students and ranked low with respect to total time alotted for instruction. Apparently, a program of less duration than six weeks is not able to satisfy most students' information needs in all three instructional components. On the other hand, programs that had attempted too lengthy of a day - 8 to 9 consecutive hours - were felt to be too intense and students became overtired. Residential programs were able to offer the same number of hours of study, but broken into different activities, such as formal instruction, trip to a local agency, dinner with a Mexican family, then homework after that. This type of scheduling apparently allowed participants to absorb more information in a less intense manner.

A number of people at many of the institutes commented that pre-placement language testing was inadequate (e.g., participants were grouped inaccurately for instruction). Many felt that this caused the loss of valuable instructional time, and some students were held back or felt lost in the classroom while arrangements

for moving people around had to be made. Few respondents knew what their FSI level was, either before or after the program, and more than one director mentioned that the language ability testing was very subjective and results often bore little resemblance to the person's actual skill level.

An additional problem with language skill level was voiced by participants (and at least one director) at sites where there were several participants with particularly low or particularly high skills. At the sites with participants who had virtually no experience in the second language, other participants felt the whole program was held back because non-language courses had to be conducted in English which made an immersion setting impossible. (As we noted earlier, the most successful language programs appeared to be those that came closest to approximating an immersion ambience.) On the other hand, some participants at institutes that had accepted fluent bilingual teachers complained that their skill level was handicapping to the other students in that they did not share the same instructional needs.

Clearly, two issues need to be dealt with: (1) if individuals with very low or very high second language skills should be included in the program along side those with more moderate skills; and (2) if some more standardized and reliable method of pre-placement language testing can be developed.

With respect to the assessment curriculum, there appears to be a concern, particularly among those individuals who are familiar with more than one institute, that some standardization of the assessment curriculum take place. Each institute hires a different set of personnel with particular biases and special knowledge of particular instruments and techniques. The result then is that students learn different curricula. It has been suggested that since among the different institutes there has been an accumulation of a considerable amount of expertise in this area, the possibility of combining this in some way would provide a breadth of assessment information and skills that is not currently offered. Suggestions in this area have included a curriculum package that could be distributed to the institutes, or separate instruction in assessment at central sites.

Along with the concern for standardizing the assessment curriculum for all students, we can deduce from participants' comments and our own quantitative analyses that there is a need to tailor the total curriculum to the differing needs of first time participants versus returnees. Participants who have already experienced the assessment and culture curricula of an institute may be better able to utilize their time in more intensive language instruction. On the other hand, some students who have greater expertise in the second language may wish to devote more time to refining their assessment skills. Participants apparently had considerably varying views about whether the institutes' major focus

should be on language, assessment, or culture. Both the participants' needs and expectations should probably be better evaluated prior to the beginning of instruction.

Some institute directors and participants complained that no-shows at the beginning of the program caused problems in scheduling, staffing, etc. and suggested that something should be done to guarantee a commitment from potential attendees. One suggestion was that a refundable fee be assessed to help insure the seriousness of the applicant.

Finally, we must note that the question of the relative effectiveness of programs located in Mexico (or other countries) versus those located in the U.S. appears to be a non-issue. While the "ambience" of the programs in Mexico was clearly an asset, and the opportunity to live with a Mexican family invaluable, with respect to language and culture training some in-state programs were rated very high and it was apparently possible to create a very successful language immersion program in Los Angeles or the Central Valley of California.

V SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

Going back to the original questions we asked at the beginning study we have been able to draw a fair number of conclusions. First we asked: What is the overall perception of the effectiveness of the institutes by both participants and supervisors?

The answer here is that participants were generally quite satisfied with the institute experience and some institutes were more successful than others with respect to producing satisfied clients. Overall we would evaluate the institutes as being at least moderately successful since only about a quarter of participants felt the curricula had not focused on their needs; the remaining three-quarters stating that the curriculum content was at least adequate for their needs.

Among those supervisors who commented on the program's value - which was a little more than half of all participants' supervisors - there was an overwhelming endorsement of the program with 84 percent stating it was helpful to have an institute trained person on the staff and another 93% feeling that the State should continue to provide the program.

The second question we asked was: Which instructional practices are most successful in achieving competency in the three instructional component areas?

For language instruction we were able to determine that an immersion-style program providing intensive language "bombardment" and a highly integrated curriculum was rated as most successful by students. Role-playing, videotaping, telephone tutors and the

opportunity to interact informally with Mexican family members as well as Spanish speaking migrant students were methods that enhanced students' enjoyment and learning.

With respect to cultural instruction, participants appeared to appreciate most a curriculum that acknowledged their cognizance of contemporary issues and characteristics of minority populations and instead focused on historical issues and socio-psychological underpinnings of present day problems. Interestingly, experiencing the "living culture" in Mexico did not produce particularly high ratings for those cultural components that took place in Mexico.

Assessment instruction was rated highest when it was taught by an acknowledged expert in the field and accompanied by adequate time to get to know the materials and techniques well. An added advantage was being able to have "hands-on" experience with children like the ones participants would be working with in their actual job situations. Interestingly, program directors and institute evaluators found more flaws in the assessment curricula than were reported by the participants. This will be dealt with in greater detail under Recommendations.

Third, we asked: <u>What are the information needs of the participants with respect to the three instructional components</u>?

With respect to language instruction, participants made clear that they wanted a great deal of conversational practice, a focus on "useable" language versus a strong emphasis on grammatical detail and verb conjugation, an emphasis on special education terminology as an integrated part of instruction, experience talking with families,

parents and students. They did not feel they needed to learn "textbook" Spanish (or Asian languages) in the traditional fashion, and many students were particularly adamant that they needed to know the "living language" spoken in the Southwest U.S. as opposed to an Academia Real version that might be most acceptable in embassy salons.

Participants as a whole felt that cultural instruction was often condescending and needed to focus more on history or special topics such as sub-group behaviors (e.g., gangs; inter-ethnic problems) than on the traditional aspects of culture such as songs, dances, foods, etc. that most were already familiar with. Most importantly, it seemed, the conveyer of the message had to be a representative of the culture with whom students felt a rapport and for whom they had genuine respect.

With respect to assessment, participants tell us they need to know more about what is available, and they need time to become familiar with the instruments and the opportunity to use them in the language of the students. They also need opportunities to interpret their findings to parents. Additionally, they need to communicate with each other about problems and solutions they all encounter. This latter aspect of their needs appears to be well served by a follow-up component to the program that allows them to bring up problems that arise on the job.

Fourth, we asked: How should/do instructional practices and informational needs differ for participants depending on particular

background characteristics?

We found some interesting differences among participants based on ethnicity, occupational role, and number of years attending an institute.

With respect to ethnicity, the two targeted groups - Hispanics and Asians - both felt that more time and care needed to be devoted to the cultural component of the programs. This view was not shared by Anglos - Anglos wanted a different curriculum but no more time devoted to it. Some Hispanics felt too much time was devoted to language and would have preferred spending that time on assessment instruction.

Occupational role had a considerable effect on participants' learning needs. School psychologists were more inclined to want to focus their instructional time on language while speech and language people wanted more assessment instruction geared towards their needs. Nurses found the assessment component fairly useless for their purposes.

Years attending the program also produced some different needs and attitudes. People who had attended more than once were generally more satisfied with the program organization as a whole. Multiple-time attendees were anxious for more language instruction and less of the other two components, while first-time attendees were more inclined to feel the amount of time devoted to language was realistic, but more critical of the content. However, we feel there is a need to do a more careful analysis of multiple-time

attendees looking at their level of language skill (which participants were unable to tell us) and the specific institutes attended in the past. In this way, repetitive curricula could be eliminated from their programs and language instruction geared more precisely to their needs.

Finally we asked: Which key program features should be included in all institutes? To answer this question we turn to our recommendations.

B. Recommendations

1. Programs should not be cut in time significantly below the six week period that most have adhered to if they plan to continue with all three instructional components.
2. Programs should also not extend for more than about 6 hours a day without significant breaks to reduce the risk of student "burn-out" or oversaturation.
3. A better method for assessing students' language skill before the start of the program should be investigated. A more standardized and reliable approach would facilitate future evaluation as well as minimize time lost in placing students in appropriate groups.
4. The assessment curriculum overall should be more equalized to focus on speech and language issues, instruments, and techniques as well as psychological assessment. Also, the particular needs of bilingual teachers, resource specialists, nurses, and others should be examined to see if it is reasonable for them to participate in the same courses

with psychologists and speech/language specialists.

5. Consideration should be made of the possibility of standardizing the assessment curriculum so that all students could receive greater breadth and take advantage of the range of accumulated knowledge and experience offered by instructors at various sites. This might be accomplished by separating the assessment and language components, offering assessment at a few local sites utilizing the same personnel and a "packaged" curriculum. Language instruction could then take place in Mexico or U.S. sites.
6. The assessment component should include more "hands-on" experience with students who are comparable to the ones that institute participants will actually be working with. The UOP site offered an excellent example of how this might be done.
7. Assessment and language components should attempt to provide more opportunities for participants to communicate test findings and observations to parents or parent-like subjects.
8. Institutes should be directed and staffed by special education personnel and others who are familiar with special education. It is probably inappropriate for institutes to be run by bilingual educators or education generalists.
9. As in virtually all other educational programs, the quality of the teaching staff is paramount to the success of the program. Instructors should be selected on the basis of

enthusiasm, ability to communicate with students, openness, and accessibility (instructors who can only be available for short periods in the classroom are probably not appropriate except for occasional short-term consultants), in addition to expertise. The institutes now have a list of instructors who have been particularly successful with students.

10. Programs should strive to utilize the knowledge of "target group participants" (Hispanics and Asians) in the culture component. Interesting and informative discussions can take place utilizing these resources. The Cal State L.A. program was observed to do this quite successfully.
11. The special needs of returning participants should be assessed with respect to level of second language ability and past experience with institute curricula.
12. Institutes should consider asking applicant to pay a refundable fee to help insure the seriousness of the application and reduce last minute no-shows.
13. To the extent possible all programs should attempt an immersion-type curriculum which allows the maximum possible use of the second language throughout the day. Students who cannot profit from this should probably be segregated into different groupings.
14. All institutes should consider including a follow-up component to the regular curriculum. The La Verne institute has provided an interesting example of this approach. This

follow-up program should be evaluated to help in developing other follow-ups.

15. The State Department of Education should consider providing an inservice workshop for all institutes selecting some of the most successful instructors (which we have identified) to share curriculum and teaching strategies with other institute personnel.
16. The State Department of Education should consider funding successful programs for more than one year at a time to help them to retain staff from one year to the next and reduce unnecessary paperwork.

REFERENCES

BABEL/Se Sabe, Spanish Education - Spanish Acquisition for Bilingual Education, Oakland, Calif: Bay Area Bilingual Education.

Foley, P.T., 1981 Second Language and Assessment Training Program, A memo. California State Department of Education, December 1981.

Los Angeles County Superintendent of School, Evaluation Report. Intensive Spanish Language Training for School Psychologists And Speech and Language Specialists. Los Angeles, 1981.

Oppenheim, A.N., Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Scriven, M., Glass, G. and David, A., Evaluation of Second Language Institutes, Report to the California Department of Education, Summer 1981.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

SECOND LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

SITE SURVEY

I. GENERAL

Program duration

Number of weeks _____

Number of hours per day _____

Total number of hours _____

Program location

Classroom

Field Study:

Other:

II. STAFFING

Number of Full-time staff _____

Areas of expertise/title:

Number of Part-time staff _____

Areas of expertise/title:

III PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
(observation)

IV PARTICIPANTS

School psychologists _____

Speech/language Specialists _____

Resource Specialists _____

Bilingual Educators _____

School nurses _____

Total _____

Language Ability Range:

Are participants grouped in any way?

Do all participants follow the same sequence of instruction?

V LANGUAGE TRAINING

Number of hours
(or % time) _____

General instructional philosophy:

indicate * emphasis	Course Content	Media of instruction lecture/lab/observ/convers/other
	(1) Basic language instruction (grammar, syntax, vocab.)	
	(2) Conversational skills	
	(3) Language Acquisition/ Speech & Language issues	
	(4) Talking to parents (instruction in appropriate language)	
	(5) Language of Tests	
	(6) Other:	

ED 235 685 EVALUATION OF SECOND LANGUAGE INSTITUTES FOR CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

2 OF 2 GANDARA, PATRICIA CALIFORNIA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, SACRAMENTO. DIV. OF SPECIAL EDUCATION. MAY 83 158P.

VI CULTURE

Number of hours
(or % time) _____

General instructional philosophy:

indicate * emphasis	Course Content	Media of Instruction lecture/observ/immersion/disc/other
	(1) General present-day cultural characteristics of Hispanics/Asians	
	(2) History of the cultural group(s)	
	(3) Intra-group differences (e.g., South American/Mexican; Vietnamese/Chinese)	
	(4) Culture as it affects academic performance and the experience of schooling	
	(5) Culture conflict	
	(6) Other:	

VII ASSESSMENT

Number of hours
(or % time) _____

General instructional philosophy:

indicate * emphasis	Course Content	Media of instruction lecture/demo/pract/disc/other
	(1) Survey of instruments/ techniques	
	(2) Admin. of formal tests	
	(3) Informal assessment	
	(4) Interpretation of test info	
	(5) Intrepretting results to parents	
	(6) Knowledge of program placement options	
	(7) Knowledge of laws affecting assessment	
	(8) Using interpreters	
	(9) Translating tests (limitations associated with this)	
	(10) Other:	

SECOND LANGUAGE INSTITUTES SURVEY

Which institute did you attend during the summer of 1982:

[] Cal State LA
[] Babel/Guadalajara
[] La Verne/Cuernavaca
[] Fullerton
[] UOP/Stockton
[] San Diego
[] Tulare
[] Stanislaus
[] King City

GENERAL OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM (Please check one box only):

1. How would you describe the total length of the program you attended:

   [] too short [] about right [] too long

2. How would you describe the daily length of the program:

   [] too short [] about right [] too long

3. How important a factor was the location of the program in your decision to attend an institute:

   [] not very important [] mildly important [] very important

   **If you answered very important, please indicate why:

   [] wanted to experience culture/people in the area of the program
   [] convenient (e.g., affordable, close to home)
   [] wanted linguistic immersion
   [] wanted to "get away"/pleasant surroundings
   [] other_____

4. How would you evaluate the number of participants in the program you attended:

   [] too few [] about right [] too many

5. Were you happy with the professional composition (school psychologists, speech/language specialists, etc.) of the participants in your program?

   [] yes [] No

   **If you answered no, please indicate why:

   [] prefer all one professional group
   [] prefer better balance between all groups that attended
   [] prefer that other professionals be included
   [] other_____

6. How would you evaluate the language ability of the participants in your program, generally:

   [] too low [] about right [] too advanced [] too varied

7. How would you evaluate the instructional groupings for the language instruction component (I.e., ability level groupings):

   [] not very effective [] moderately effective [] very effective
   [] participants were not grouped by language ability level

8. How would you evaluate the instructional groupings for the special education/assessment component:

[] not very effective [] moderately effective [] very effective
[] participants were not grouped for this component

9. In your opinion, were there sufficient staff to adequately cover all of the subject areas you had expected to study:

[] yes [] no

INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT - LANGUAGE

10. How would you evalute the percentage of time devoted to language instruction:

[] too little [] about right [] too much

11. How would you describe the language instruction you received:

[] instruction did not focus on what I needed to learn most
[] instruction was adequate
[] instruction focused exactly on what I needed to know

12. How would you evaluate the methods used to teach language:

[] boring, not very motivating
[] standard, adequate, moderately interesting
[] creative, innovative, kept me interested

13. How would you evalute the instructor(s) of the language component:

[] not very good [] adequate/good [] excellent
[] varied, uneven (some better than others)

CULTURE

14. How would you evaluate the percentage of time devoted to instruction about the target culture(s):

[] too little [] about right [] too much

15. How would you describe the cultural instruction you received:

[] instruction did not focus on what I needed to learn most
[] instruction was adequate
[] instruction focused exactly on what I needed to know

16. How would you evaluate the methods used to teach culture:

[] boring, not very motivating
[] standard, adequate, moderately interesting
[] creative, innovative, kept me interested

17. How would you evaluate the instructor(s) of the culture component:

[] not very good [] adequate/good [] excellent
[] varied, uneven [] no formal instruction occurred

ASSESSMENT

18. How would you evaluate the percentage of time devoted to instruction on assessment:

[] too little [] about right [] too much

19. How would you describe the assessment instruction you received:

[] instruction did not focus on what I needed to learn most
[] instruction was adequate
[] instruction focused exactly on what I needed to know

20. How would you evaluate the methods used to teach assessment:

[] boring, not very motivating
[] standard, adequate, moderately interesting
[] creative, innovative, kept me interested

21. How would you evaluate the instructor(s) of the assessment component:

[] not very good [] adequate/good [] excellent [] varied, uneven

UNIQUE ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM

22. Was there anything you consider to have been especially unique, innovative or good about this program that you think should be included in future programs?_____

_____

_____

23. Were there any problems that you noted in the program that should be avoided in future programs?_____

_____

_____

PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION (Please check the appropriate box):

Sex: [] male [] female

Ethnicity: [] White/Anglo [] Hispanic [] Black [] Asian
[] Other

How many times have you attended a Second Language Institute:

[] 1 [] 2 []3

In which professional capacity do you work:

[] school psychologist [] Resource teacher
[] school nurse [] Bilingual teacher
[] speech/language specialist [] Other_____

What was your FSI level when you entered the program in summer 1982?

_____

Since attending the Second Language Institute has your professional role changed officially?

[] yes [] no If yes, how?_____

_____

unofficially?

[] yes [] no If yes, how?_____

_____

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

So that we can gather data on how the Second Language Institutes are affecting the delivery of services in the field we are asking that you give us the name and address of a supervisor/administrator with whom you have worked. We want to send him/her a short questionnaire that asks about the various contributions that Second Language Institute participants make within their area. YOU WILL NOT BE IDENTIFIED AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE DOES NOT ASK ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT ANY INDIVIDUAL PERSONS. However, this phase of the evaluation is very important since it will supply us with much needed information about how the Second Language Institutes are helping schools to better serve their students. For this reason we urge you to complete this section of the questionnaire.

Name of supervisor/administrator with whom I have worked (preferably a principal or central office person who makes decisions about staff/resource allocations):

Title: _____

Mailing address: _____

* * * * * * * * * * *

*OPTIONAL: Your name _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

* Names are asked only to aid in keeping track of returned questionnaires. You are not obligated to identify yourself if you do not wish to do so.

SECOND LANGUAGE INSTITUTE EVALUATION

Supervisors' Survey

1. Were you aware that anyone under your spervision had participated in the Second Language Institute?

   yes____ no_____

   **If you answered yes, please complete the following:

2. Have you noticed any improvement in this (these) person(s) language skills that might be attributed to participation in the program? yes_____ no_____ don't know_____

3. Have you noticed any improvement in this (these) person(s) assessment skills that might be attributed to participation in the program? yes_____ no_____ don't know_____

4. Have you noticed any improvement in this (these) person(s) ability to communicate with parents and community members that might be attributed to participation in the program? yes_____ no_____ don't know_____

5. Have you increased responsibilities or your personal reliance on this (these) person(s) since their participation in the program? yes_____ no_____

   please explain _____

   _____

   _____

6. Are you better able to comply with legal requirements for assessing Limited English Speaking students as a result of having a Second Language Institute-trained person on your staff? yes_____ no____ don't know_____

7. Has it been helpful to you to have a Second Language Institute trained person on your staff?

   yes_____ no_____

   please explain_____

   _____

   _____

8. Based on your experience, do you think it is useful for the State to provide this kind of a program?

   yes_____ no_____

9. Any additional comments?:_____

   _____

   _____

   _____

Name_____ (optional)

Institute_____

THANK YOU.

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILES

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILE

Institute: U. of Laverne - Cal State San Bernardino

Director: Steve Wagner

I. General

Program duration: 5 weeks, plus 10 monthly follow-up sessions

Total hours of instruction: 125, plus approximately 70 hours follow-up

Program location:

Special education courses: Calif. State College, San Bernardino classrooms

Language Instruction: private residence, Cuernavaca, Mexico

Other: Follow-up, offices of Riverside and San Bernardino Superintendents' of schools

II. Participants

Number of participants 20

Professional affiliation:

school psychologists	5
speech/lang specialists	5
resource specialists	3
bilingual educators	5
school nurses	1

Language Ability Range: 2-5

Groupings:

4 levels of language instruction

Interdisciplinary teams of 3-4 participants for clinic and assessment practica

III. Staffing

Full-time staff: 5

--Director/Assessment Specialist
--four language trainers

Part-time staff: 4

--one bilingual/special education specialist

staffing cont. . .

--one language assessment specialist
--one speech/reading specialist
--one evaluator

Criteria for selecting staff: Specialists who could work with each professional group; known to director; available and affordable.

IV. Instructional Content

A. Language Instruction

Percent time: Approximately ~~35%~~ 45% of total time (including follow-up)
Approximately 50% of 5-week program (Extensive additional opportunity to practice with Mexican family)

Emphases of Instruction (in order of importance):

1. Acquisition of basic language skills (grammar, syntax, vocab.)
2. Conversational skills
3. Talking to other professionals

Methods of instruction

1. Lecture/drill
2. Informal conversation
3. Observation

Background of instructors: All native Spanish speakers who are bilingual in English, trained and experienced in Spanish as a second language instruction.

B. Culture

Percent time: Approximately ~~5%~~ 20% formal instruction (students are informally immersed in Mexican culture in Cuernavaca)

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Present-day Mexican culture
2. Culture as it affects academic performance

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Immersion

Culture cont. . .

2. Lecture
3. Videotape

Background of instructor(s): One Mexican-American consultant; otherwise instruction occurs informally.

C. Assessment 35%

Percent time: ~~25%~~ of 5 week session

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Survey of instruments/techniques
2. Administration of formal tests
3. Interpreting test information

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture/demonstration
2. Practicum

Background of instructors: Professor of special education with experience with bilingual populations; Mexican specialists in children's learning and audiological problems.

V. Unique features of the Program

1. Participants grouped into IEP teams for assessment instruction/practicum
2. Monthly follow-up training sessions
3. Combination U.S.-Mexico sites to maximize personnel/financial resources
4. Stress management workshop
5. Students live with Mexican families
6. Emphasis on hand-outs and carry-away materials

VI. Problems noted by Staff/Director

1. Program could function more optimally with more students (e.g., 30 rather than 20)
2. Director stretched too thin - need more consultants to take over teaching functions of the director
3. Some logistical problems in transporting participants

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILE

Institute: CSULA - L.A. County Superintendent of Schools
Director: Chuck Acosta

I. General

Program duration: 6 weeks

Total hours instruction: 207 including telephone tutoring

Program location:

courses: CSULA classrooms

field study: LA County school sites; Paramount School District

other: Occasional trips of E.L.A. "Community"

II. Participants

Number of participants: 35

Professional affiliation:

school psychologists: 12

speech/lang specialists: 12

resource specialists: 2

bilingual educators: 9

Language Ability Range: 2-4 (Director noted subjectivity of ratings)

Groupings:

4 levels of Language Ability

Some grouping according to occupation (e.g., technical courses for speech/language specialists and school psychologists)

III. Staffing

Full-time staff: 4.5

--2 language instructors
--2 psychologists
--1 speech/lang. specialist (1/2 time)

Part-time staff: 4

--short term consultants/speakers

Criteria for selecting staff: strong Spanish language fluency; language oriented perspective.

IV. Instructional Content

A. Language Instruction

Percent time: 60% (formal) Groups I & II; 30% (formal) Groups IIIa & IIIb

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Acquisition of basic language skills
2. Conversational skills
3. Language acquisition theory
4. Communicating with parents
5. Language of tests

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Conversation
2. Lecture
3. Role-playing

Background of instructors: Self-employed specialists in Spanish language instruction for bilingual teachers and special education personnel.

B. Culture

Percent time: approximately 15% (formal)

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. General present-day characteristics of Chicanos
2. Culture as it affects academic performance
3. Chicano/Anglo culture conflict
4. Historical perspective on Chicano culture

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture
2. Discussion
3. Observation

Background of instructor(s): One school psychologist; one language instructor

C. Assessment

Percent time: 25% (formal) Groups I & II; 55% (formal) Groups IIIa & IIIb

assessment cont. . .

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. survey of instruments and techniques
2. Interpreting test information
3. Informal assessment
4. Knowledge of laws affecting assessment

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture/demonstration
2. Role-playing
3. Practicum with students in schools
4. Pairing psychologists with Bilingual specialists for field practica

Background of instructor(s): 2 school psychologists; 1 speech/language specialist

V. Unique Features of the Program

1. Highly integrated program; interdisciplinary staff (language, culture, assessment taught in a coordinated, overlapping manner)
2. Telephone tutoring
3. Strong emphasis on Chicano/LA County population

VI. Problems noted by staff/director

1. Some reluctance on part of students to participate in assessment component; more interested in language instruction

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILE

Institute: California State University, Fresno

Director: Juan Flores

I. General

Program duration: 4 weeks

Total hours of instruction: 140

Program location:

this program has 1 main, and two branch locations. This description deals with the Fresno State University site.

Courses:

classrooms at Fresno State University campus.

Field study:

none

II. Participants

Number of participants: 16

(Altogether about 50 students participate in the Institute's Spanish instruction. Twenty are Institute participants, the rest are bilingual teachers "on waiver" studying Spanish as part of work toward a credential.)

Professional affiliation:

school psychologists 3

speech and language specialists 11

resource specialists 1

bilingual educators 0

school nurses 1

Language ability range: 0-2

Groupings:

according to language proficiency, not profession. Both Institute participants and Bilingual teachers study Spanish together, but split up for Assessment lectures.

III Staffing

Full-time staff:

--one program coordinator (shared by Spanish for Bilingual teachers program)
--two second language (Spanish instructors) three additional Spanish instructors teach as part of the jointly administered Institute and Spanish for Bilingual teachers program.

staffing cont. . .

Part-time staff: 3

--consultants in charge of the assessment, and culture components of program.

Criteria for selecting staff: teaching skills, experience in second language instruction, testing, assessment of LEP students. Experience locally with primarily Mexican, or Mexican-American populations.

IV. Instructional Content

A. Language Instruction

Percent time: 74%

Emphases of Instruction (in order of importance): HILT (High Intensity Language Training) method used.

1. Acquisition of basic language skills
2. Improving grammar, vocabulary, syntax

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Programmed text
2. Conversation
3. Drill

Background of instructors: Professor, La Raza Studies, California State University, Fresno; Spanish teacher, Fresno Unified School District.

B. Culture (also taught primarily in Spanish)

Percent time: discussion of culture interspersed throughout program. Generally discussed together with assessment and testing issues.

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. General present-day cultural characteristics of Hispanics
2. Intra-group differences
3. Culture as it affects academic performance, and schooling.
4. (Emphasis on the Mexican immigrant to the Central Valley) Ability to communicate cross-culturally.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture
2. Discussion

Background of instructor: Associate Professor, Psychology Department, Fresno State Univ., Psychologist and Assessment Specialist, Fresno County Dept., of Education.

C. Assessment

Percent time: 18% (one day/week dedicated to assessment)

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Limitations and pitfalls of using formal tests with LEP and Hispanoparlantes.
2. Review of formal and informal tests and their adequacy.
3. Research in testing, bilingualism, language acquisition.
4. Impact of biculturalism/bilingualism on tests
5. Spanish terms for dealing with special education issues.

(assessment lectures conducted primarily in Spanish)

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture
2. Role-playing
3. Discussion
4. Formal written materials

Background of instructor: Associate Professor, Psychology Department, Fresno State; Psychologist and Assessment Specialist, Fresno County Department of Education.

V. Unique Aspects of Program:

1. Nearly all instruction conducted in Spanish.
2. Program well-supported by its University sponsor, and by local school district communities in the Central Valley.
3. Program geared to use local resources, assumes most participants will resume work with Central Valley Mexican-American populations.
4. Good relations, respect between Institute students and administrators.
5. Program's key emphasis on Spanish language acquisition.
6. Dual program administration has cut some administrative costs.

VI. Problems noted by the staff/director:

1. Some problem with non-shows. Director suggests a non-refundable application fee to increase committment to actual enrollment.
2. Assessment component needs to be better integrated with rest of program. Director suggests scheduling

change from assessment lecture one day/week, to smaller modules during rest of week.

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILE

Institute: California State University, Fresno-Stanislaus Site

Director: Juan Flores

I. General

Same as for other two sites (Fresno, Tulare) except Program location is: classrooms at California State College Stanislaus campus.

II. Participants

Number of participants: 13

Professional Affiliation:

special ed teachers	2
school psychologists	5
speech/lang. specialists	1
resource specialists	4
bilingual educators	0
school nurses	1

Language Ability Range C-2

Groupings:

Participants grouped according to language facility. Assessment instruction conducted with all participants in a single group.

III. Staffing

Full-time staff: 2

Part-time staff: 3

IV. Instructional Content

A. Language Instruction

Percent time 74%

B. Culture

Percent time integrated

C. Assessment

Percent time 18%

V. Unique Aspects of the Program

Nearly all instruction in Spanish
Well supported by University professors
Geared to local personnel who serve students in area

VI. Problems noted by Director/Staff

Need to develop pool of identified

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILE

Institute: University of Pacific

Director: Michael Gilbert

I. General

Program duration: 6 weeks

Total hours of instruction: 232 plus occasional after-hours excursions

Program location:

courses: University classrooms, Stockton

field study: Public elementary school, Stockton

other: Occasional trips to Stockton "community"

II. Participants:

Number of participants: 14

Professional affiliation:

school psychologists: 6

speech/lang specialists: 7

resource specialists: 1

Language Ability Range: 0-3 (several students entered with very low ability)

Groupings:

2 levels of language instruction
--Low FSI's 80% language/culture; 20% assessment
--Hi FSI's 60% language/culture; 40% assessment

2 levels of professional specialty
--school psychologists
--speech/language

There is some mixing of the groups for lectures on assessment, but this is not extensive.

III. Staffing

Full-time staff: 4

--one language instructor
--one culture specialist
--one assessment specialist
--one speech/language specialist

staffing cont. . .

Part-time staff: 4

--short-term consultants in bilingual-bicultural testing and second language acquisition

Criteria for selecting staff: teaching skills, good reputation as instructors
Director/Administrator

IV. Instructional Content

A. Language Instruction

Percent time: 60% Low FSI's; 40% Hi FSI's

Emphases of Instruction (in order of importance):

1. Acquisition of basic language skills
2. Improving grammar, vocabulary, syntax

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Programmed text
2. Drill
3. Conversation

Background of instructor: High school Spanish and biology teacher

B. Culture

Percent time: 20%

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Historical perspective
2. Intra-group differences
3. Present-day characteristics of Hispanics

Methods of instruction (in order of importance/ use):

1. Lecture
2. Audio-visual
3. Discussion
4. Observation

Background of instructor: History professor

C. Assessment

Percent time: 40% Hi FSI's; 20% Low FSI's

Assessment cont. . .

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Administration of formal tests
2. Research in testing, bilingualism, lang. acquisition
3. Survey of instruments and techniques

Methods of instruction (in order of importance/use):

1. Practicum with spec. ed./Sp. spking children
2. Lecture
3. Textbook
4. Role-playing

Background of instructor(s): Bilingual school psychologist; speech/ lang. specialist

V. Unique Features of the Program

1. Strong cultural component focusing on historical aspects of Hispanic cultures
2. Extensive "hands-on" experience with exactly the same kind of children participants are likely to encounter in schools. (These children were largely migrant, potential spec. ed., Spanish-speaking.)

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILE

Institute: California State University, Fresno
Kings-Tulare County Center

Director: Juan Flores

Kings-Tulare County Site Coordinator: Arturo Flores

I. General

Program duration: 4 weeks

Total hours of instruction: 140

Program location: Attractive building housing Tulare County Education Offices.

Courses: classrooms at Tulare County Education Offices

Field study: none

II. Participants

Number of Participants: 13

(This Institute is also part of a jointly administered Spanish HILT program for bilingual teachers on "waiver." Total students in facility numbered 40.)

Professional affiliation:

school psychologists 0
speech and language specialists 2
resource specialists 6
bilingual educators 0
school nurses 0
"other" 3

Language ability range: 1-2 primarily.

Groupings:

according to language proficiency. Both Institute participants and bilingual teachers study Spanish together. Three times/week all Institute participants are brought together for lectures on assessment.

III. Staffing

Full-time staff: 9 altogether working with both Institute and HILT for bilingual teachers program.

Working with Institute participants alone: 3

--one site coordinator
--one Spanish instructor
--one assessment and testing specialist

Staffing cont. . .

Part-time staff: 1 (language instructor (doubles as assessment coordinator.)

Criteria for selecting staff: teaching skills, experience, good reputation, familiarity with Central Valley LEP students.

IV. Instructional Component

A. Language Instruction

Percent time: 90%

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance): HILT and OLE methods used.

1. Acquisition of basic language skills. Emphasis on cross-cultural communications.
2. Improving grammar, vocabulary, syntax.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Programmed text
2. Conversation
3. Drill

Background of instructors: College level Bilingual Education Instructors, School District Specialist in Assessment and Testing, native Spanish speaker.

B. Culture

Percent time: Interspersed throughout program. 4% Discussed together with language and assessment issues.

Emphasis of instruction (in order of importance):

1. General present-day cultural characteristics of Hispanics.
2. Culture as it affects academic performance and schooling.
3. Intra-group differences, cultural conflict.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture
2. Discussion
3. Written materials

Background of Instructor: School District specialist in Assessment and Testing.

c. Assessment

Percent time: 6% (45 minutes, three P.M.'s/week)

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance): Lectures conducted entirely in Spanish.

1. Survey of instruments/techniques.
2. Problems of assessing Mexican-Americans, other minority groups.
3. Formal and informal assessment.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture
2. Discussion
3. Role playing
4. Review of written materials

Background of instructor: Bilingual Speech Therapist, PhD from Boston University. Native Spanish speaker.

V. Unique Aspects of Program:

1. Nearly all instruction conducted in Spanish.
2. Instructors very experienced, high caliber.
3. Good relations, good rapport between Institute participants and instructors.
4. Students take turns preparing lunch with assistance of two professional cooks. Students and instructors eat together, encouraging further practice of Spanish.
5. This is an experienced, well-run Spanish program. Though a newer component, the Assessment instruction is complete and well-grounded in theory, as well as application.

VI Problems noted by staff/director:

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILE

Institute: California State University, Fullerton

Director: Anthony Vega

I. General

Program duration: 4 weeks

Total hours of instruction: 160

Program location:

Courses: elementary school classrooms leased from Garvey School District, Rosemead

Field study: public elementary school, Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD); Chinatown Service Center, Los Angeles

Other: trips to Santa Ana College and Vietnamese shopping area, Orange County.

II. Participants

Number of participants: 9

Professional affiliation:

school psychologists:	1
speech/lang specialists:	2
resource specialists	1
bilingual educators:	5

Language ability range: 0-State competency (several students entered with very low ability)

Groupings:

students divided into Cantonese, and Vietnamese groups. (six students in first, 3 in second group.)

Groups study assessment and culture together.

Groups divided by language interest, not professional background.

III. Staffing

Full-time staff: 4

--one Cantonese instructor
--one Vietnamese instructor
--one assessment specialist
--one coordinator

staffing cont. . .

Part-time staff: 12

--short-term consultants in bilingual-bicultural testing, second language acquisition, and facets of Asian culture lectured as part of program 3 times/week.

Criteria for selecting staff: areas of expertise, teaching skills, good reputation.

IV. Instructional Content

A. Language Instruction

Percent time: 62% for all students

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Acquisition of basic language skills
2. Improving vocabulary, grammar, syntax
3. Developing oral and written communication skills for use in school situations.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Conversation
2. Role-playing
3. Programmed text
4. Audiolingual approach (drill through individual use of tapes.)

Background of instructor: University language instructors.

B. Culture

Percent time: 21%. Difficult to estimate. Culture interspersed in language instruction, and assessment

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. General present-day cultural characteristics of Asian groups residing in California.
2. Intra-group differences.
3. Culture as it affects academic performance.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture
2. Discussion
3. Observation

Background of instructors: academics, lay practitioners.

C. Assessment

Percent time: approximately 17%. Altogether, 3 hours per day were set aside for Assessment and Culture.

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Development, use of informal tests, other alternate assessment tools.
2. Survey of Asian community resources related to assessment.
3. Cultural aspects of assessment.
4. Use of interpreters
5. Interpreting results to parents.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture
2. Discussion
3. Practicum with special ed/Cantonese/Vietnamese speakers.
4. Role-playing

Background of instructor: Bilingual School Psychologist, aided by consultants representing a variety of backgrounds.

V. Unique Aspects of Program

1. Strong assessment and cultural component focusing on current aspects of Asian cultures in U.S.
2. Considerable hands-on experience with types of children participants likely to work with.
3. Much individualized language instruction, facilitated by small program size.
4. Good relationship between program administrators and participants. (Mutual respect)
5. Participants' experience acknowledged and put to use in stimulating discussions, other classroom participation.
6. Catered lunch on site for staff and students, encourages Cantonese and Vietnamese language practice

VI. Problems noted by the staff/director

1. Due to budget cuts, program shortened from proposed six, to four weeks. Assessment practica reduced.
2. Low enrollment size blamed on late notification of funding.
3. Need to improve method of informing interested clientelle about program.

4. Stipend for teachers attending identified as potential method for increasing interest in program.

5. Housing allowance identified as contributing to program attractiveness for those outside area. No on-campus nearby housing available for students.

6. Students felt an overseas visit component (to Hong Kong or Taiwan) would increase program attractiveness.

PROGRAM FEATURE PROFILE

Institute: NHU

Director: B. Roberto Cruz

I. General

Program duration: 5 weeks

Total hours instruction: 147.5 formal, including home tutorial plus 25-50 hours lunch-time conversations with families

Program location:

Courses: Universidad Autonoma de Guad. Classrooms

Other: Hosts' homes in Guadalajara

II. Participants

Number of participants 50

Professional affiliation:

school psychologists:	15
speech/lang specialists:	14
resource specialists:	12
bilingual educators:	9

Language ability range: 2-4

Groupings:

5 levels of language ability
2 Assessment groups (psychologists/speech)

III. Staffing

Full-time staff: 9

--Institute Director
--Coordinator
--Testing Specialist
--Bilingual Education Specialist
--five language instructors

Part-time staff: 1

--Counselor/liaison connected with the Universidad Autónoma

Criteria for selecting staff: competence, ability to work together as a team.

IV. Instructional Content

A. Language Instruction

Percent time: approximately 70% formal instruction, however program is total immersion.

Instructional Content Cont. . .

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1a. Conversational skills for beginners, Reading, writing

1b. Reading comprehension, writing and translation for more advanced.

2. Language of tests.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1a. Guided conversation

1b. Lecture/practicum

2. Immersion

Background of instructors: Language instructors and bilingual teacher trainers for NHU.

B. Culture

Percent time: approximately 15% formal, incorporated into language instruction

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Present-day cultural characteristics of Chicanos.

2. History of Chicanos.

3. Intra-group differences.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture

2. Readings

3. Immersion in Mexican culture

Background of instructors: Language/teacher trainers.

C. Assessment

Percent time: Approximately 30%

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Survey of instruments and techniques.

2. Interpretation of test information.

Methods of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Lecture

2. Demonstration

3. Role-playing

Background of instructor: Bilingual test specialist, university professor

V. Unique features of the program

1. Program designed with stong leaders to keep things running smoothly and keep students on track.
2. Mexican families used as instructors.
3. Continuous evaluation by participants to make program responsible to their needs.

VI. Problems noted by staff/director

1. Director suggests that a single assessment curriculum with a broader range of instruments and techniques should be developed and disseminated to all institutes so that there is both uniformity and breadth in this component.
2. Director thinks more direct student and parent contact is desirable for the NHU program; parent interview component should be incorporated.

INSTITUTE PROFILE

Institute: San Diego County Department of Education
Director: Rosalia Salinas

I. General

Program duration: 6 weeks

Total hours of instruction: 180

Program location:

courses: San Diego County Department of Education facilities.

field study: none . Entire program on - site only.

II. Participants:

Number of participants: 14?

Professional affiliation:

school psychologists: 9

speech/lang specialists: 3

bilingual educators: 1

resource specialists: 3

Language Ability range: 0-3 (FSI) level. Program designation, beginning, intermediate, advanced.

Groupings: 3 levels of language instruction (Beginning, intermediate, advanced). Groups receive individual language lessons in A.M., but mix for lectures on assessment and culture in P.M.'s.

III. Staffing:

Full-time staff: 2

-- one director

-- one instructor doubling as assessment coordinator and advanced Spanish instructor.

Part-time staff: 3 plus an assortment of short-term consultants

-- one assistant director(in charge of culture component)
-- two Spanish instructors

-- short-term consultants in bilingual-bicultural education, testing, and second language acquisition.

Criteria for selecting staff: teaching skills, recommendation by Hispanic Training Institute as language and assessment instructors.

IV. Instructional Content

A. Language Instruction

Percent time: 50% for all language ability levels.

Emphases of Instruction (in order of importance)

1. Basic language instruction (grammar, syntax, vocabulary)
2. Acquisition of basic language skills

Methods of Instruction (in order of importance)

1. Programmed text
2. drill
3. conversation

Background of instructor: relatively inexperienced language instructors used. (Advanced Spanish instructor a native speaker, currently a testing and assessment specialist for LEP kids in an Eastern school district.)

B. Culture

Percent time: 20%

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance)

1. General present-day cultural characteristics of Hispanics
2. Intra-group differences, culture conflict
3. Culture as it affects academic performance and the experience of schooling.

Methods of instruction: (in order of importance/use)

1. lecture
2. discussion (culture/assessment lectures conducted primarily in English)

Background of Instructor:

Many guest lecturers were professors in Multicultural Education, Bilingual Education, at San Diego State Univ.

C. Assessment

Percent time: 30 % for all participants

Emphases of instruction (in order of importance):

1. Models of assessment for LEP child.
2. Survey of instruments/technicques
3. Administering formal tests

Methods of instruction (in order of importance/use):

1. Lecture
2. Demonstration
3. Discussion

Background of instructor: Bilingual Assessment Specialist/ School District

V. Unique Aspects of the Program

1. Uses Hispanic Training Institute Language Approach.
2. Attracts extremely sophisticated, experienced participants.
3. Located in attractive setting.

VI. Problems noted by the staff/director

1. Poor relations between Student/participants and program staff. Students (school psychologists, speech/language/ resource specialists)felt program administrators from the bilingual education field did not tailor program to student needs.
2. Students disappointed with lack of practica/experience with real LEP students. Also wished off-site visits to nearby cultural and assessment resources.
3. Advanced Spanish students criticized language training as not being complete, not offering sufficient homework, practice.
4. Disappointment also expressed over student-perceived low level of sophistication of assessment and culture issues discussed.
5. No instructor available to encourage students to practice Spanish during their lunch break.
6. Use of assessment coordinator who doubled as language instructor caused problems.
7. Use of assessment coordinator experienced in working with non-Californian, non-Mexican-American students caused problems.

APPENDIX C

TASK OUTLINE

TASK 1. Develop observation/interview instrument.

1.1 Read all related documents concerning the development and goals of the Second Language Institutes.

1.2 Review all funded proposals for 1982 institutes.

1.3 Design questions that reflect both method and content of programs applicable across sites. Questions should reflect appropriate goals of the institutes as outlined by the Department of Education.

1.4 Pilot draft instrument.

1.5 Review and revise instrument according to pilot feedback. (See Appendix A for sample of instrument)

TASK 2. Observe and interview at each institute site.

2.1 Assign one evaluator to each site for a period of one to two days.

2.2 Stagger assignments to facilitate communication between evaluators after each visit. This assures that any modification in procedures deemed necessary can take place immediately and be incorporated into the remaining site visits.

TASK 3. Develop Program Feature Profiles for each institute.

3.1 Analyze observation/interview protocols to identify key elements of philosophy, staffing, ambiance, and method and content for each of the three instructional components: language, culture and assessment.

3.2 Write up profiles for each institute using standard format.

3.3 Send profiles to each director for review and comments. This assures that we have not erred in our perceptions of the program. (Profiles are non-judgmental and simply act as a mirror to reflect key elements of each institute as they have been implemented.)

3.4 Revise and finalize profiles based on directors' comments.

TASK 4. Develop Participant Survey Form based on analysis of program feature profiles.

4.1 Sample questions:

•When you began the Second Language Institute this summer, what was/were your greatest need(s) in the area of assessment of LEP children (check as many as apply):

[] knowledge of test theory and application specific to language minority children

[] exposure to greater variety of appropriate tests

[] practice administering tests

[] practice interpreting tests

[] opportunities to convey test results to parents

[] other_____

•For each of the following, please note whether or not you feel you received sufficient instruction/practice.

	not enough	sufficient	too much
•test theory & application specific to language minority children			
•exposure to variety of appropriate tests			
•practice administering tests to appropriate subjects			
•practice interpreting tests			
•conveying results to parents			
•other_____			

4.2 Include the following: "In order to better document the effectiveness of the Second Language Institutes, we would appreciate it if you would provide us with the name, address and telephone number of your most immediate supervisor(s). We will send him/

her/them a survey form requesting them to check the ways in which the skills you acquired at the Second Language Institute have enhanced services to LEP children. These surveys will be totally anonymous and we will request that neither your name nor your supervisor's name be noted on the return form. We appreciate your cooperation in this matter since the data collected from this survey will enhance our chances of providing future Second Language Institutes."

TASK 5. Mail out surveys.

5.1 Mail out follow-up postcard 10 days later reminding participants to return surveys.

5.2 Make follow-up telephone calls one week later to urge participants to return surveys that have not been received.

5.3 Continue follow-up activity to attempt to achieve 100% return rate. 90% is lowest acceptable rate.

TASK 6. Develop and mail out Supervisor Survey.

6.1 Code surveys according to institute attended by participant only.

6.2 Mail out postcards 10 days later to all supervisors reminding them to return surveys.

6.3 Make follow-up phone calls to supervisors keyed to institutes with significantly low returns only.

TASK 7. Analysis of Participant Surveys.

7.1 Use cross-tab analysis to ascertain which features are most important to which participants.

7.2 Use cross-tab analysis to ascertain which participants considered themselves to benefit most from (1) overall program; (2) specific components.

7.3 Use frequency analysis to ascertain which program features are considered key by most participants.

7.4 Use descriptive analysis to ascertain program effects on on-the-job performance.

TASK 8. Analysis of Supervisor Surveys.

8.1 Use cross-tab analysis to group high effectiveness ratings with particular program feature clusters.

8.2 Use descriptive and frequency analyses to demonstrate ways in which Second Language Institute training benefits the schools.

8.3 Analysis of any anecdotal material that is received.

TASK 9. Write Final Report.

9.1 Describe general features of programs.

9.2 Combine information from Tasks 7 and 8 into report.

9.3 Use observation, anecdote and incidental information gathered during Task 2 to illuminate the findings.

9.4 Make recommendations for strengthening the institutes.

TASK 10. Dissemination

10.1 Develop Executive Summary especially geared to future Second Language Institute Directors and staff.

10.2 Submit 100 copies each of Final Report and 250 copies of Executive Summary to Office of Special Education.

10.3 Prepare outline for presentation to Special Education Commission.

10.4 Prepare briefing for Office of Special Education and Office of Bilingual Education personnel.

APPENDIX D

FREQUENCY PROFILES

INSTITUTE: Cal State L.A. N: 30 (35)

% Return: 86%

SEX

Male	17%
Female	83%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	77%
Hispanic	20%
Black	0
Asian	3%
Other	0

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	43%
Twice	37%
Three	20%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	33%
Nurse	0
Speech	37%
Res. Sp.	13%
Biling Tch	10%
Other	3%
Missing	3%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	20%
Unofficial	37%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	67% ab. right
	23% too long
Daily	80% ab. right

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	83%
Reasons	77% cited convenience

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	0
Ab. right	83%
Too many	0

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	77%
Like change	23%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	83%
Too varied	0

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	3%
Mod effec	33%
Very effec	63%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	0
Mod effec	70%
Very effec	27%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	90%
No	7%
Missing	3%

INSTITUTE: Cal State L.A.

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	43%
Ab. right	53%
Too much	3%

CONTENT

Did not focus	3%
Adequate	47%
Did focus	47%

METHODS

Boring	3%
Standard	47%
Creative	50%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0
Adequate	23%
Excellent	67%
Varied	10%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	23%
Ab. right	60%
Too much	17%

CONTENT

Did not focus	17%
Adequate	60%
Did focus	23%

METHODS

Boring	20%
Standard	43%
Creative	33%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0
Adequate	40%
Excellent	40%
Varied	17%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	3%
Ab. right	70%
Too much	23%

CONTENT

Did not focus	23%
Adequate	46%
Did focus	30%

METHODS

Boring	7%
Standard	67%
Creative	27%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	7%
Adequate	27%
Excellent	27%
Varied	37%

INSTITUTE: NHU Guadalajara N: 48 (50)

% Return: 96%

SEX

Male	29%
Female	71%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	75%
Hispanic	21%
Black	0%
Asian	0%
Other	2%

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	67%
Twice	29%
Three	4%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	33%
Nurse	0%
Speech	27%
Res. Ps.	13%
Biling Tch	15%
Other	13%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	19%
Unofficial	44%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	81% ab. right
Daily	88% ab. right

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	94%

Reasons: language & cultural immersion
no one cited convenience

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	0%
Ab. right	92%
Too many	8%

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	90%
Like change	0%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	67%
Too varied	23%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	0%
Mod effec	50%
Very effec	48%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	14%
Mod effec	38%
Very effec	48%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	73%
No	25%

INSTITUTE: NHU Guadalajara

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	23%
Ab. right	63%
Too much	15%

CONTENT

Did not focus	31%
Adequate	33%
Did focus	35%

METHODS

Boring	19%
Standard	63%
Creative	19%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	4%
Adequate	46%
Excellent	27%
Varied	23%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too littel	35%
Ab. right	46%
Too much	17%

CONTENT

Did not focus	42%
Adequate	56%
Did focus	2%

METHODS

Boring	48%
Standard	44%
Creative	8%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	25%
Adequate	35%
Excellent	13%
Varied	13%
No formal inst.	5%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	46%
Ab. right	48%
Too much	4%

CONTENT

Did not focus	15%
Adequate	31%
Did focus	52%

METHODS

Boring	8%
Standard	50%
Creative	40%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	4%
Adequate	23%
Excellent	69%
Varied	2%

INSTITUTE: UOP

N: 11 (14)

% Return: 79%

SEX

Male	27%
Female	73%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	73%
Hispanic	0%
Black	18%
Asian	9%
Other	0%

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	82%
Twice	18%
Three	0%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	36%
Nurse	0%
Speech	36%
Res. Sp.	0%
Biling Tch	0%
Other	9%
Combined	18%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	0%
Unofficial	46%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	73% ab. right
	27% too long
Daily	18% ab. right
	82% too long

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	82%
Reasons	64% convenience
	36% other/missing

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	9%
Ab. right	91%
Too many	0%

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	91%
Like change	9%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	27%
Too varied	46%
Too low	18%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	36%
Mod effec	64%
Very effec	0%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	9%
Mod effec	36%
Very effec	55%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	91%
No	9%

INSTITUTE: UOP

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	64%
Ab. right	36%
Too much	0%

CONTENT

Did not focus	82%
Adequate	18%
Did focus	0%

METHODS

Boring	82%
Standard	18%
Creative	0%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	73%
Adequate	27%
Excellent	0%
Varied	0%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	0%
Ab. right	91%
Too much	9%

CONTENT

Did not focus	0%
Adequate	18%
Did focus	82%

METHODS

Boring	0%
Standard	9%
Creative	91%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0%
Adequate	9%
Excellent	91%
Varied	0%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	27%
Ab. right	55%
Too much	18%

CONTENT

Did not focus	18%
Adequate	55%
Did focus	27%

METHODS

Boring	18%
Standard	64%
Creative	18%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	9%
Adequate	55%
Excellent	36%
Varied	0%

INSTITUTE: La Verne N: 12 (19)

% Return: 63%

SEX

Male	17%
Female	83%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	58%
Hispanic	33%
Black	8%
Asian	0%
Other	0%

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	75%
Twice	17%
Three	8%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	33%
Nurse	0
Speech	25%
Res. Sp.	8%
Biling Tech	17%
Other	8%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	8%
Unofficial	50%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	75% ab. right
	25% too short
Daily	92% ab. right

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	75%
Reasons:	culture & long imm.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	0
Ab. right	100%
Too many	0

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	92%
Like change	0

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	67%
Too varied	17%
Too advanced	17%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	0
Mod effec	42%
Very effec	58%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	17%
Mod effec	33%
Very effec	8%
Not grouped	42%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	67%
No	25%
Missing	1

INSTITUTE: La Verne

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	17%
Ab. right	83%
Too much	0

CONTENT

Did not focus	8%
Adequate	58%
Did focus	33%

METHODS

Boring	8%
Standard	58%
Creative	33%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	8%
Adequate	25%
Excellent	50%
Varied	17%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	17%
Ab. right	83%
Too much	0

CONTENT

Did not focus	8%
Adequate	58%
Did focus	33%

METHODS

Boring	0
Standard	42%
Creative	58%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	8%
Adequate	42%
Excellent	33%
Varied	8%
Miscellaneous	8%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	50%
Ab. right	50%
Too much	0

CONTENT

Did not focus	42%
Adequate	42%
Did focus	17%

METHODS

Boring	25%
Standard	50%
Creative	25%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	25%
Adequate	42%
Excellent	25%
Varied	8%

INSTITUTE: San Diego N: 8 (14)

% Return: 57%

SEX

Male	50%
Female	50%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	63%
Hispanic	25%
Black	0%
Asian	0%
Other	0%

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	75%
Twice	25%
Three	0%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	50%
Nurse	13%
Speech	25%
Res. Sp.	0%
Biling Tch	0%
Other	13%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	13%
Unofficial	0%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	63% ab. right
	25% too long
Daily	63% ab. right
	25% too long

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	100%
Reasons	88% convenience

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	25%
Ab. right	75%
Too many	0%

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	75%
Like change	25%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	50%
Too varied	25%
Too low	25%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	0%
Mod effec	50%
Very effec	50%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	38%
Mod effec	13%
Very effec	0%
Not grouped	50%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	50%
No	50%

INSTITUTE: San Diego

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	88%
Ab. right	12%
Too much	0%

CONTENT

Did not focus	38%
Adequate	25%
Did focus	38%

METHODS

Boring	25%
Standard	25%
Creative	50%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	25%
Adequate	25%
Excellent	25%
Varied	25%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	0%
Ab. right	12%
Too much	88%

CONTENT

Did not focus	63%
Adequate	38%
Did focus	0%

METHODS

Boring	75%
Standard	25%
Creative	0%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	50%
Adequate	12%
Excellent	0%
Varied	38%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	25%
Ab. right	38%
Too much	38%

CONTENT

Did not focus	100%
Adequate	0%
Did focus	0%

METHODS

Boring	88%
Standard	12%
Creative	0%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	50%
Adequate	0%
Excellent	0%
Varied	50%

INSTITUTE: Fullerton

N: 8 (9)

% Return: 89%

SEX

Male	12%
Female	88%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	38%
Hispanic	0%
Black	0%
Asian	63%
Other	0%

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	75%
Twice	25%
Three	0%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	12%
Nurse	0%
Speech	25%
Res. Sp.	12%
Biling Tch	38%
Other	12%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	12%
Unofficial	25%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	63% ab. right
	38% too short
Daily	88% ab. right
	12% too long

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	63%
Reasons	50% convenience

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	63%
Ab. right	38%
Too many	0%

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	50%
Like change	50%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	12%
Too varied	63%
Too advanced	12%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	25%
Mod effec	25%
Very effec	38%
Not grouped	12%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	12%
Mod effec	25%
Very effec	25%
Not grouped	38%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	88%
No	12%

INSTITUTE: Fullerton

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	25%
Ab. right	75%
Too much	0%

CONTENT

Did not focus	12%
Adequate	63%
Did focus	25%

METHODS

Boring	0%
Standard	75%
Creative	25%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0%
Adequate	38%
Excellent	63%
Varied	0%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	50%
Ab. right	50%
Too much	0%

CONTENT

Did not focus	12%
Adequate	75%
Did focus	12%

METHODS

Boring	0%
Standard	63%
Creative	38%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0%
Adequate	50%
Excellent	25%
Varied	12%
Missing	12%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	12%
Ab. right	63%
Too much	12%
Missing	12%

CONTENT

Did not focus	25%
Adequate	63%
Did focus	0%
Missing	12%

METHODS

Boring	0%
Standard	75%
Creative	0%
Missing	25%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0%
Adequate	63%
Excellent	12%
Varied	12%
Missing	12%

INSTITUTE: Fresno

N: 8 (16)

% Return: 50%

SEX

Male	12%
Female	88%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	88%
Hispanic	12%
Black	0%
Asian	0%
Other	0%

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	88%
Twice	0%
Three	12%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	12%
Nurse	12%
Speech	50%
Res. Sp.	25%
Biling Tch	0%
Other	0%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	0%
Unofficial	25%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	50% ab. right
	25% too short
	25% too long
Daily	50% ab. right
	25% too short
	25% too long

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	100%
Reasons	63% convenience

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	63%
Like change	37%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	37%
Too varied	37%
Too adv.	25%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	0%
Mod effec	25%
Very effec	75%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	75%
Mod effec	12%
Very effec	12%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	37%
No	50%
	12%

INSTITUTE: Fresno

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	25%
Ab. right	75%
Too much	0%

CONTENT

Did not focus	25%
Adequate	37%
Did focus	37%

METHODS

Boring	0%
Standard	63%
Creative	37%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0%
Adequate	12%
Excellent	63%
Varied	25%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	12%
Ab. right	37%
Too much	50%

CONTENT

Did not focus	25%
Adequate	75%
Did focus	0%

METHODS

Boring	25%
Standard	63%
Creative	12%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0%
Adequate	25%
Excellent	37%
Varied	37%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	50%
Ab. right	12%
Too much	37%

CONTENT

Did not focus	75%
Adequate	25%
Did focus	0%

METHODS

Boring	63%
Standard	25%
Creative	12%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	12%
Adequate	25%
Excellent	12%
Varied	50%

INSTITUTE: Tulare

N: 12 (13)

% Return: 85%

SEX

Male	9%
Female	90%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	100%
Hispanic	0%
Black	0%
Asian	0%
Other	0%

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	73%
Twice	18%
Three	9%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	0%
Nurse	0%
Speech	18%
Res. Sp.	46%
Biling Tch	0%
Other	36%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	9%
Unofficial	18%
Missing	27%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	82% ab. right
	18% too long
Daily	100% ab. right

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	64%
Reasons	86% convenience

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	0%
Ab. right	100%
Too many	0%

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	91%
Like change	0%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	64%
Too varied	18%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	9%
Mod effec	36%
Very effec	55%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	27%
Mod effec	64%
Very effec	9%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	100%
No	0%

INSTITUTE: Tulare

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	9%
Ab. right	91%
Too much	0%

CONTENT

Did not focus	0%
Adequate	55%
Did focus	36%
Miss.	9%

METHODS

Boring	0%
Standard	18%
Creative	82%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	9%
Adequate	0%
Excellent	46%
Varied	46%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	0%
Ab. right	82%
Too much	18%

CONTENT

Did not focus	9%
Adequate	82%
Did focus	9%

METHODS

Boring	0%
Standard	46%
Creative	54%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0%
Adequate	36%
Excellent	27%
Varied	36%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	27%
Ab. right	55%
Too much	9%

CONTENT

Did not focus	9%
Adequate	73%
Did focus	9%

METHODS

Boring	9%
Standard	64%
Creative	18%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0%
Adequate	55%
Excellent	18%
Varied	18%

INSTITUTE: Stanislaus N: 9(13)

% Return: 69%

SEX

Male	33%
Female	67%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	100%
Hispanic	0
Black	0
Asian	0
Other	0

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	89%
Twice	11%
Three	0

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	44%
Nurse	11%
Speech	0
Res. Sp.	22%
Biling Tech	0
Other	11%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	11%
Unofficial	44%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	78% ab. right
	22% too short
Daily	89%
	11% too long

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	89%
Reasons:	100% convenient

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	0
Ab. right	100%
Too many	0

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	78%
Like change	22%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	44%
Too varied	11%
Too low	33%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	
Mod effec	56%
Very effec	44%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	33%
Mod effec	33%
Very effec	11%
Not grouped	22%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	78%
No	22%

INSTITUTE: Stanislaus

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	22%
Ab. right	78%
Too much	0

CONTENT

Did not focus	0
Adequate	78%
Did focus	22%

METHODS

Boring	11%
Standard	22%
Creative	68%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0
Adequate	0
Excellent	56%
Varied	44%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	0
Ab. right	89%
Too much	9%

CONTENT

Did not focus	0
Adequate	56%
Did focus	44%

METHODS

Did not focus	0
Adequate	56%
Did focus	44%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	0
Adequate	33%
Excellent	67%
Varied	0

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	56%
Ab. right	33%
Too much	11%

CONTENT

Did not focus	44%
Adequate	44%
Did focus	11%

METHODS

Boring	33%
Standard	56%
Creative	11%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	33%
Adequate	44%
Excellent	11%
Varied	11%

OVERALL FREQUENCIES

N: 146

% Return: 80%

SEX

Male	23%
Female	77%

ETHNICITY

Anglo	75%
Hispanic	16%
Black	2%
Asian	5%
Other	7%

TIMES ATTENDED

Once	68%
Twice	25%
Three	8%

PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

Schl Psy	30%
Nurse	2%
Speech	29%
Res. Sp.	15%
Biling Tch	11%
Other	11%
Comb.	4%

PROFESSIONAL ROLE CHANGE

Official	14%
Unofficial	37%

PROGRAM LENGTH

Total	73%	ab. right
	13%	too short
	13%	too long
Daily	78%	ab. right
	4%	too short
	16%	too long

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION

Very important	86%	
Reasors	41%	convenience
	20%	lang/cult.imm.
	7%	language
	4%	culture

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Too few	8%
Ab. right	87%
Too many	5%

PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION

Good	82%
Like change	18%

LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Ab. right	60%
Too varied	25%
Too low	7%
Too high	7%

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION GROUPINGS

Not effec	6%
Mod effec	43%
Very effec	50%

ASSESSMENT GROUPINGS

Not effec	16%
Mod effec	42%
Very effec	29%

STAFF COVERAGE

Yes	77%
No	21%

OVERALL FREQUENCIES (page 2)

LANGUAGE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	33%
Ab. right	62%
Too much	6%

CONTENT

Did not focus	23%
Adequate	42%
Did focus	34%

METHODS

Boring	16%
Standard	49%
Creative	36%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	10%
Adequate	28%
Excellent	43%
Varied	20%

CULTURE

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	21%
Ab. right	58%
Too much	20%

CONTENT

Did not focus	25%
Adequate	57%
Did focus	18%

METHODS

Boring	26%
Standard	42%
Creative	31%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	12%
Adequate	33%
Excellent	32%
Varied	16%
No formal inst.	5%

ASSESSMENT

TIME DEVOTED

Too little	32%
Ab. right	51%
Too much	14%

CONTENT

Did not focus	29%
Adequate	41%
Did focus	28%

METHODS

Boring	19%
Standard	55%
Creative	25%

INSTRUCTORS

Not good	11%
Adequate	33%
Excellent	36%
Varied	17%